DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 651 EA 024 300

AUTHOR Benson, Lee; Harkavy, Ira
TITLE Progressing beyond the Welfare State.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Universities and Community Schools; v2 n1-2 p2-28 1991

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Schools; *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Innovation; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Role of Education; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Dewey (John); *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines a neo-Deweyan strategy to transform American public schools into genuine community schools that function as central agencies for the development of a democratic welfare society. John Dewey's thesis was that a well-functioning school system constitutes the necessary, though not sufficient, condition for a well-functioning society. The first part and second parts examine how Dewey's work was influenced by Francis Bacon's idea of progress and Benjamin Franklin's thoughts on the reformation of higher education. The third part discusses Dewey's philosophy of education and his approach to reforming the American public school system. Part 4 explains the concept and development of cosmopolitan community schools and sketches a project designed to help the John C. Turner Middle School in West Philadelphia transform itself from a bureaucratic innercity school into a radically innovative, effective community school. The process for changing Turner Middle School into a university-assisted, cosmopolitan community school is described in the next part, with emphasis on the formation of the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC) in 1985 and the evolution of the community school's organizational structure. The final section outlines the relationship among universities, cosmopolitan local communities, and a democratic welfare society. The basic proposition is "schooling for service and by service," in which universities help transform their local public schools into cosmopolitan community schools that function as multipurpose community centers. (Contains 50 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350651

Progressing Beyond the Welfare State

A Neo-Deweyan Strategy; University-Assisted, Staff-Controlled and Managed, Community-Centered Public Schools as Comprehensive Community Centers to Help Construct and Organize Hardworking, Cohesive, Caring, Cosmopolitan Communities in a Democratic Welfare Society

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ira Harkavy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Lee Benson and Ira Harkavy

EA 024/300

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Viewed in historical perspective, the public school system and the Welfare State constitute two of the major institutional inventions of the 19th and 20th centuries. In Western societies, particularly after World War II, both institutions spread widely, expanded rapidly, and aroused great expectations. Their combined effects, proponents confidently proclaimed, would: a) help overcome or remedy ancient ills such as ignorance, poverty, disease, disability, crime; b) continually raise levels of societal well-being; c) revive and revitalize the idea of progress. In recent decades, however, both institutions have fallen from grace—and at an accelerating rate.

Almost everywhere in Western society, public schools and the Welfare State have suffered an increasing variety of increasingly harsh criticisms. Subjected to the empirical test of reality and time, critics charge, both have demonstrably failed to live up to expectations. At minimum, they have failed to produce the good results predicted for them. On balance, some critics even charge, in complex and subtle ways, both institutions have done much more harm than good, retarded rather than advanced progress.

Particularly in the United States, as cities in general, and "inner-city ghettos" in particular, have increasingly become shameful, horrifying, pathological population aggregates rather than livable communities, criticisms of the public school system and the Welfare State have widened, deepened, and produced major political consequences. Public schools, critics charge, have become far more costly but fail to educate students; instead, they produce and/or contribute to learned helplessness, hopelessness, alienation, self-destructive behavior and violence. The Welfare State (in general) has also become far more costly. But rather than promote the general welfare, it weakens self-reliance, produces new and more complex forms of dependency, substitutes centralized, bureaucratized, depersonalized administration for affective, effective, caring help in time of need.

To present a balanced, subtle assessment of the growth, functioning, and direct and indirect consequences of the American public school system and Welfare State would take a long book—more accurately, a long series of long books. In this essay, we cannot even pretend to do anything like that, even in oversimplified form. Instead, our primary purpose is to suggest that the complex, subtle, radical defects built into both sets of institutions can only be remedied and transcended if we view and treat them together—view and treat them as dynamically interactive, interdependent, components of a highly complex societal system.

More precisely, our primary purpose is to extend, develop, and support John Dewey's basic hypothesis: in a rapidly industrializing, urbanizing, technologically-advancing, interactive, interdependent world, the public school system is *the* critical institution for construction of the genuinely democratic communities necessary for the well-being of American society. If the public school system works badly, then American society *must* work badly. More positively stated, as we interpret Dewey's hypothesis, it asserts that a well-functioning public school system constitutes the necessary, though not sufficient, condition for a well-functioning American society.

Put still another way, what we try to do in this essay is outline a Neo-Deweyan strategy to help transform American public schools into genuine community schools that function as central agencies for the construction and development of a Democratic Welfare Society (defined below in the last section of this essay). To do that, we begin by suggesting how John Dewey in the late 19th and 20th centuries developed, combined, and transcended a variety of ideas advanced by Francis Bacon in the 17th century and Benjamin Franklin in the 18th century.[1]

1. Francis Bacon and the Idea of Progress

Heated controversy exists today about Francis Bacon's specific contributions to modern science and philosophy of science. Almost everyone agrees, however, that his eloquent passionate prophecy of the great good that would result from development of a genuinely experimental science of inquiry contributed powerfully to the 17th century Scientific Revolution and the idea of progress it helped inspire and spread. To John Dewey, Bacon ranked as one of the great figures in world intellectual history.

In one of Dewey's major books, *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (1920) he praised Bacon as "the great forerunner of the spirit of modern life," the "prophet of new tendencies," and the "real founder of modern thought." Bacon's devastating criticisms of the "great body of learning" and aristocratic idealist methodology handed down from antiquity, as well as his criticisms of the tradition-bound institutions (e.g., universities) which transmitted and perpetuated antiquated learning and methodology, powerfully helped revolutionize scientific inquiry and effectively began modern thought.[2]

In Dewey's view, Bacon's far-reaching proposition, "Knowledge is Power," provided the radical, pragmatic criterion needed to test, assess, and demonstrate the relative effectiveness of traditional and modern modes of inquiry and thought. Bacon invoked accepted religious doctrines to argue persuasively that by their fruits shall we judge those two modes of inquiry and thought—shall we assess their relative capacity to produce genuine knowledge, their relative capacity to generate continuous discovery of new truths rather than dogmatic, scholastic, idealist, authoritarian, repetition of "eternal truths." Instead of looking backwards to ancient authorities and make inquiry and learning support conservatism and the societal status quo, Dewey emphasized, Bacon critically invoked:

> . . . progress as the aim and test of genuine knowledge . . . . accustoming the mind to think of truth as already known . . . [classical logic] habituated men to fall back on the intellectual attainments of the past and to accept them without critical scrutiny . . . .
>
> A logic of discovery [as called for by Bacon] on the other hand looks to the future. Received truth it regards as something to be tested by new experiences rather than something to be dogmatically taught and obediently received. Its chief interest in even the most carefully tested ready-made knowledge is the use which may be made of it in further inquiries and discoveries. Old truth has its chief value in assisting the detection of new truth . . . . *Ever renewed progress is to Bacon the test as well as the aim of genuine logic* [emphasis added].[3]

In effect, Dewey praised Bacon for presenting a brilliant analysis of the sociology of knowledge:

> To Bacon, error had been produced and perpetuated by social influences, and truth must be discovered by social agencies organized for that purpose. The great need [Bacon proclaimed] is the organization of co-operative research, whereby men attack nature collectively and the work of inquiry is carried on continuously from generation to generation.[4]

Accordingly, Dewey hailed Bacon's utopian work, *The New Atlantis*, for "its great positive prophecy of a combined and co-operative pursuit of science such as characterizes our own day."[5]

Writing in the early 20th century, bedazzled perhaps by the wonders of modern science, Dewey failed to note that Bacon's vision of the appropriate organization of research was so radical and comprehensive that, even today in 1991, it remains far from realization. To produce knowledge, effective organization was necessary. But for scientific inquiry actually to result in the "relief of man's estate" (i.e., continuous human betterment), Bacon emphasized, two other conditions must also be satisfied: a) knowledge must be pursued for the *right motives*; b) the organization of research must not be one-sided—it must comprehend the planned, dynamic, systemic, *integrated production and use of knowledge for specified ends-in-view*. Absent those two conditions, Bacon predicted in effect, the new mode of scientific inquiry would have a Faustian, Frankensteinian, Strangelovian, arrogantly over-reaching character.

Put another way, Bacon asserted that organized research entailed *both* the production and the use of knowledge. If production were isolated or separated from use, however, the results would not be beneficial. For knowledge to function as power for good, effective organization must dynamically, systemically plan for the *integrated* production and use of knowledge. Undertaken for the wrong (amoral or immoral) reasons, one-sided concentration on the production of new knowledge would have dreadful consequences—a Baconian insight and prophecy whose truth and power, alas, in 1991, we see daily and horribly confirmed.[6]

It is a commonplace that American universities and researchers, particularly since 1945, have become ferociously competitive and self-aggrandizing. To justify that orientation and behavior, proponents of competitive self-aggrandizement dogmatically assert that it powerfully stimulates the pursuit of knowledge and produces great progress. Francis Bacon warned, however, that it is "not possible to run a course aright when the goal itself is not rightly placed." Why pursue knowledge? Bacon stressed the critical nature of that question in the lengthy *Preface* to his *magnum opus*, *The Great Instauration*

(1620)—a preface one Baconian scholar characterizes as an essay of "extraordinary power."[7] Warning of the subtlety of Nature and the weakness of Man, Bacon admonished his readers (and the world):

> Lastly, I would address one general admonition to all, that they consider what are the true ends of knowledge, and that *they seek it not* [emphasis added] either for pleasure of the mind, or for contention, or for superiority to others, or for profit, or fame, or power, or for any of these inferior things; but for the benefit and use of life; and that they perfect and govern it in charity. For it was from lust of power that the angels fell, from lust of knowledge that men fell; but of charity there can be no excess, neither did angel or man ever come in danger by it.

Particularly during the 19th and 20th centuries, at an accelerating rate, Bacon's impassioned admonition has either been disregarded or explicitly dismissed as naively unrealistic and counterproductive. Ideologically convinced that what he stigmatized as "inferior things" functioned positively rather than negatively, American researchers and universities have behaved in ways diametrically opposed to the altruistic motivation argued for by Bacon. To read the 1620 Preface of the "real founder of modern thought" and observe the ferociously competitive, self-aggrandizing state of the American "knowledge industry" in 1991 powerfully testifies to the power of the "law of unintended consequences."

To an even greater extent perhaps, the growth of the American knowledge industry has violated Bacon's other proposition that to realize the idea of progress, to achieve the "true ends of knowledge," the "relief of man's estate," the system for the organization of research must explicitly purposefully, systemically, dynamically *integrate* the production *and* use of knowledge. In Bacon's version, the production and use of knowledge were highly complementary, interdependent, interactive, *mutually-beneficial*. Defending him against the harsh criticisms of 19th and 20th century detractors, a leading scholar, Benjamin Farrington, caustically dismissed the charge that Bacon consistently subordinated scientific inquiry to practical aims.

> This is a serious error. Bacon insisted again and again on the virtual identity of scientific truth and practical utility. "What is most useful in practice is most correct in theory . . . ." "The improvement of man's mind and the improvement of his lot are one and the same thing."[8]

What tends to be overlooked in theory and almost totally ignored in practice, however, is Bacon's insistence that the dynamically integrated production and use of knowledge was both critical for progress and required well-planned, highly effective, complex organization. In our judgment, violation of that radical Baconian proposition had—and continues to have—terrible consequences. That is, the legacy of the ancient Greek aristocratic false dualism between "superior" pure theory and "inferior" applied practice helps explain the gap between the awesome increased capacity of human beings since the 17th century to produce scientific and technological knowledge and the horrifying state of the world in 1991. Succinctly stated, science and technology have fantastically outrun social and societal organization—a condition Bacon optimistically, though mistakenly, believed would be avoided by thoughtful planning on the part of human beings wise enough to understand and command Nature.

In his utopian fable, *The New Atlantis* (1627), Bacon sketched a comprehensive organizational system for the increasingly progressive, integrated production and use of knowledge. As far as we know, no systematic study has ever been published to explain why that aspect of Bacon's plan that focused on the organized *production* of knowledge had such tremendous influence on subsequent generations and why that aspect that focused on the *use* of knowledge had such little influence. In any event, given the course of world history since 1627, we think it reasonable to assert that, in the late 20th century, American universities and researchers should stop concentrating almost exclusively on the production of new knowledge and give their highest priority to solving the integrated production-use problem that Bacon brilliantly posed in *The New Atlantis*.

To support that proposition, we cite a particularly revealing example of the failure of the American governmental and knowledge systems to integrate effectively the production and use of scientific/technological advances. By now, the example and its disastrous consequences are well-known. It has had no discernable effect, however, on the anti-Baconian organization and ideology of the American knowledge system. Driven by ferociously competitive self-aggrandizement, fixated on the uncontrolled production of new knowledge, that system continues to ignore history and reality. Despite Bacon's brilliant analysis in 1627, it irrationally continues to operate on the assumption that no need exists for systemic planning and organization to deal with the production-use problem. Somehow, somewhere, some day, it assumes, someone will make practical use of new scientific/technological knowledge in some way that, on balance, optimizes beneficial and minimizes harmful consequences. To illustrate the irrationality of that anti-Baconian *haphazard production-use model of knowledge*, we cite the post-1944 revolution in cotton production in the American South.

Before 1860, as economic historians have shown, the relatively unique capacity of the American South to increase cotton production powerfully contributed to the rapid growth of manufacturing in Great Britain, Europe, and the United States. The South's near-monopoly of world cotton production, of course, also powerfully contributed to the rapid growth of black slavery before the Civil War. Given cotton's particular characteristics, its planting, cultivating, and harvesting required a tremendous amount of intensive, backbreaking hard labor at different times of the year. To a great extent, that fact shaped the distribution and form of labor (black and white) in the South, before and after 1860. As a result, for a century and a half, an increasing amount of creative scientific and technological work, ranging across a wide variety of fields (e.g., biology, chemistry, mechanical engineering), went into efforts to achieve the "total mechanization" of cotton production (i.e., elimination of hand labor in all phases from planting to harvesting).

Mechanization of Southern cotton production can effectively be dated as beginning in 1944. By the early 1960s, the process was virtually complete.[9] Viewed narrowly in terms of the complex production and coordination of new scientific and technological knowledge, the mechanization of cotton production represented a magnificent historical achievement. That is, it achieved a highly-desirable, long-sought-after goal, namely, elimination of the need for

an enormous amount of intensive, backbreaking hand labor. But achieving that goal would, predictably, have tremendous consequences (direct and indirect, short and long term) for American society. Among other things, in effect, it deliberately displaced millions of functionally illiterate black (and white) sharecroppers, tenant farmers, and small owners from cotton areas of the South. Almost as predictably, a very large percentage of the displaced Southern farm workers (and families) were pushed/pulled into Northern and Western cities at the very time manufacturing was rapidly moving out of cities and the demand for unskilled factory labor was rapidly shrinking.

Long before 1944, the terrible consequences of the agrarian enclosure movements after 1600 in Great Britain (and elsewhere in Europe) were well-known. We might reasonably have expected, therefore, that careful thought would have been given by researchers and government officials to minimizing the harmful consequences likely to result from mechanization of Southern cotton production. Nothing like that happened, however, before or after 1944. Given their anti-Baconian orientation and ideology, and the long dominant haphazard production-use model of knowledge, universities, social scientific institutions, government agencies simply ignored the problem. True, an "obscure Southern apologist" sounded the alarm in 1947 and penned this jeremiad:

> The coming problem of agricultural displacement in the [Mississippi] Delta and the whole South is of huge proportions and must concern the entire nation. . . . The country is upon the brink of a process of change as great as any that has occurred since the Industrial Revolution. . . . Five million people will be removed from the land within the next few years. They must go somewhere. But where? They must do something. But what? They must be housed. But where is the housing?
>
> Most of this group are farm Negroes totally unprepared for urban, industrial life. How will they be industrially absorbed? What will be the effect of throwing them upon the labor market? What will be their reception at the hands of white and Negro workers whose jobs and wages they threaten?
>
> There are other issues involved here of an even greater gravity [e.g., race conflict, North and South]. . . .
>
> There is an enormous tragedy in the making unless the United States acts, and acts promptly, upon a problem that effects millions of people and the whole social structure of the nation. [10]

The 1947 jeremiad had no effect. The United States did not act promptly—or even belatedly. In 1991, the "enormous tragedy in the making" is now history. More precisely, it continues to accelerate, widen, deepen, intensify, with no end in sight.

To make our argument even more forcefully, we note that, in 1961, another jeremiad was written to arouse the nation to do something to remedy the tragic consequences of the post-1944 Southern enclosure movement (and a variety of related developments resulting from brilliant scientific/technological advances). This time the author was not an "obscure southern apologist," writing in an obscure publication, gloomily predicting the future shape of things to come. The 1961 jeremiad was sounded by an "internationally-known scholar, scientist, educator, statesman and author," the ex-president of Harvard University, James Bryant Conant, in a well-publicized book, *Slums and Suburbs*—a book which explicitly resulted from his serious, well-financed, well-publicized study of junior high schools, commissioned by a major American foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York.[11]

As a result of that study, Conant became convinced that school officials in large city slums faced appalling difficulties.

> So appalling, indeed, that as I prepared to spell them out in my final report to the Carnegie Corporation, I decided to write a small book largely devoted to their consideration.
>
> I have done so because I am convinced we are allowing social dynamite to accumulate in our large cities. . . . The improvement of slum conditions is only in part a question of improving education. But the role of the schools is of the utmost importance. . . . What I should like to do is to create in the reader's mind a feeling of anxiety and concern. For without being an alarmist, I must say that when one considers the total situation that has been developing in the Negro city slums since World War II, one has reason to worry about the future. The building up of a mass of unemployed and frustrated Negro youth in congested areas of a city is a social phenomenon that may be compared to the piling up of inflammable material in an empty building in a city block. Potentialities for trouble—indeed possibilities of disaster—are surely there.

And in his "concluding observations," Conant repeated his warning:

> Social dynamite is building up in our large cities in the form of unemployed out-of-school youth, especially in the Negro slums.

For present purposes, we need not discuss Conant's analysis and proposed remedies. The critical point is that thirty years later, in 1991, the conditions that alarmed him are far worse and far more widespread. On balance, nothing has been effectively done to remedy the complex, interrelated set of problems which, Conant warned in 1961, required "prompt action before it is too late."

Full analysis of what might be called "the mechanization of cotton case" would take a series of books. We have cited it primarily to illustrate and support this proposition: Something is radically wrong with the American knowledge and schooling systems which, contrary to Bacon's optimistic expectations, permit, indeed, help cause, brilliant advances in the production of scientific and technological knowledge to have such tragic human and societal consequences. To suggest more specifically what is wrong, more importantly, to suggest what might be done to remedy the problem, we turn now to Benjamin Franklin's 18th century plan for the reformation of higher education.

2. Benjamin Franklin and the Reformation of Higher Education

During his lifetime (1561-1626), Francis Bacon's ideas had little impact. By the 1640s and 1650s, however, largely as a result of the Puritan Revolution, Bacon's "new philosophy" had become highly influential in England (and elsewhere in Europe). To quote a recent historian of the 17th century Scientific Revolution:

Bacon's philosophy seemed to be providentially designed for the needs of the Puritan Revolution. . . . Bacon gave precise and systematic philosophical expression to the anti-authoritarianism, inductivism and utilitarianism which were such important factors in the Puritan scale of values. . . [his] philosophy was explicitly conceived in the biblical and millenarian framework which was so congenial to the Puritans. . . .

Bacon's view of nature was substantiated and given a didactic impulse by Comenius [a leading educational reformer] with the result that the Puritans entered the revolutionary decades with a philosophical programme ideally suited to their mood for spiritual, social and intellectual reform. Bacon's writings came to have almost canonical authority, and they were used to induce all sections of the population to join together to exploit the potentialities of experimental philosophy. . . .

Thus one of the most direct legacies of the Puritans. . . was their effective use of the Baconian philosophy as a vehicle to implant in English society an active and exploratory approach toward the natural environment. As a consequence, experimental philosophy had before 1660 become firmly established in the system of accepted values, and the foundation had been laid for the substantial scientific achievements of the later part of the seventeenth century. The recent comparative sociological survey undertaken by Joseph Ben-David has correctly concluded that Baconianism played the leading part in making 'revolutionary England, of all the countries of the West. . . the center of the [scientific] movement during the middle of the seventeenth century.' Baconianism prevented natural philosophy from degenerating into a conflict between rival philosophical interests and it provided 'the blueprint of an ever-expanding and changing, yet regularly functioning scientific community.' The Baconianism of the Puritans supplied English science with a valid strategy for conduct and a sense of coherence which were lacking in most scientific groups elsewhere. . . . [in the 1650's] the Baconians played on active part in the promotion and establishment of the Council of Trade and in the framing of the Navigation Acts. Each of these developments was designed to give a substantial impetus to the English economy and to create conditions conducive to the full utilitarian exploitation of scientific knowledge.[12]

Like John Dewey, another native son of Puritan New England, Benjamin Franklin, viewed Francis Bacon as one of the great figures in world intellectual history. Transplanted to Philadelphia, the leading city in the American colonies, Franklin was an ardent Baconian. Thus, in 1749, in *Poor Richard's Almanack*, he commemorated the death in 1626 of "Sir Francis Bacon, *great* in his prodigious genius, parts and learning . . . ." Noting that Bacon "is justly esteem'd the father of the modern experimental philosophy," Franklin then quoted this poetic, highly significant tribute to the man who inspired his own orientation to knowledge:

> Him [i.e., Bacon] for the studious shade
> Kind nature form'd, deep, comprehensive, clear,
> Exact, and elegant; in one rich soul,
> PLATO, the STAGYRITE, and TULLY join'd.
> The great deliverer he! who from the gloom
> Of cloister'd monks, and jargon-teaching schools,
> Led forth the true Philosophy, there long
> Held in the magic chain of works and forms,
> And definitions void: He led her forth,
> Daughter of HEAV'N! that slow ascending still,
> Investigating sure the chain of things,
> With radiant finger points to HEAV'N again.[13]

An ardent Baconian, contemptuous of scholasticism, passionately devoted to the "modern experimental philosophy," Franklin continually acted on the proposition that effective organization was mandatory if knowledge were to function as power and help achieve the "relief of man's estate." Having already founded a municipal circulating library (among other things), in 1743 Franklin proposed establishment of two Baconian-inspired organizational innovations in Philadelphia. One eventually become the present-day "American Philosophical Society, held at Philadelphia, for Promoting Useful Knowledge," the other, the University of Pennsylvania.

Franklin's "Proposal for Promoting Useful Knowledge Among the British Plantations in America" was modelled after the British Royal Society. Established in the 1660s, the Royal Society "adopted" a "Baconian ideology. . . at an early stage."[14] By the 1740s, a number of similar scientific societies existed in Europe and Franklin simply proposed extending that Baconian organizational idea to America, now that the "first drudgery of Settling new Colonies. . . is pretty well over. . . ." Forming one society of "Virtuosi or ingenious men residing in the several Colonies," he observed, would help "produce Discoveries to the Advantage of some or all of the *British* Plantations, or to the Benefit of Mankind in general."[15]

Franklin's proposal to establish another strategic component of a comprehensive, utilitarian knowledge system (our term) in the American colonies was much more original—in fact, genuinely revolutionary. No copy of the 1743 version exists. But according to Edward P. Cheyney, the great historian of the University of Pennsylvania, the *1749* published version of Franklin's "Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pensylvinia," represented a compromise forced on him by associates devoted to the traditional learned languages and classical collegiate curriculum. Using a variety of documents, however, Cheyney felt able to reconstruct Franklin's "main ideas" pretty clearly:

> He would have had an education utilitarian rather than cultural, *entirely in the English language* [emphasis added], though following the best models in that language, devoting much attention to training in thought and expression. It should include mathematics, geography, history, logic, and natural and moral philosophy. It should be an education for citizenship, and should lead to mercantile and civic success and usefulness.

Writing in 1940, Cheyney then (sardonically?) concluded:

> It is unfortunate that it was never tried.[16]

Granted that we cannot reconstruct Franklin's ideas precisely. We can be confident, however, that consistent with Bacon's contempt for traditional curricula and antiquated universities suffocating "from the gloom of cloister'd monks, and jargon-teaching schools," Franklin wanted to create a radically different kind of Academy (or college) for the "complete Education of Youth."

Franklin wanted an Academy conducted in English to overcome the burden of antiquated traditions, ideas, and methods, as well as to save time and increase effectiveness. It would be an institution of higher education to train an elite, teach them useful knowledge, develop their capacity to learn and to produce useful knowledge. Above all, however, it would inculcate the Baconian ideal of acquiring and pursuing knowledge for the "betterment of humanity," for the "relief of man's estate." Put another way, Franklin's proposed college would have been a modern, integrated moral-intellectual institution dedicated to public service and the practical realization of the 17th and 18th century Commonwealth philosophy. As he conceived the college, its moral and intellectual components were symbiotic, interrelated, inextricably intertwined.

To suggest how far contemporary research universities, including Penn, have departed from Franklin's Baconian conception of the "great *Aim* and *End* of all Learning," we quote him at length. After outlining his radically innovative curriculum, Franklin concluded the 1749 pamphlet on this high note:

> With the whole should be constantly inculcated and cultivated, that *Benignity of Mind*, which shows itself in *searching for* and *seizing* every Opportunity *to serve* and *to oblige*, and is the Foundation of what is called GOOD BREEDING; highly useful to the Possessor, and most agreeable to all.
>
> The Idea of what is *true merit*, should also be often presented to youth, explain'd and impress'd on their minds, as consisting in an *Inclination* join'd with an *Ability* to serve mankind, one's Country, Friends and Family; which *Ability* is (with the Blessing of God) to be acquir'd or greatly increas'd by *True Learning*; and should be the great *Aim* and + *End* of all Learning.

Franklin's footnote, designated by the + symbol, catches the essence of his Commonwealth public philosophy:

> To have in View the *Glory* and *Service of God*, as some express themselves, is only the same thing in other Words. For *Doing Good to Men* is the *only Service of God* in our Power; and to *emulate his Beneficence* is to *glorify him*.[17]

Viewed in historical perspective and in light of Franklin's ardent Baconianism, we can clearly see that his proposal for the New World reformation of higher education was designed to give organizational form to Francis Bacon's fervent "admonition" that *utilitarian* inquiry, learning, and schooling *should fundamentally be morally inspired, guided, driven.* "What are the true ends of knowledge" and learning and why should they be sought, Bacon and Franklin asked? In Bacon's words, they should be sought neither for "pleasure of the mind, or for contention, or for superiority to others, or for profit, or fame, or power, or for any of these inferior things." Positively stated in Franklin's 18th century secular terms, they should be sought for "Doing Good to Men."

Contemporary "hard-nosed realists," of course, either ignore or dismiss contemptuously the "naive moralism" of what might be called the Baconian-Franklinian "Good Knowledge-Producing, Knowledge-Using, Learning and Schooling System." The latter-day pragmatic puritan, John Dewey, however, did not. On the contrary. We now suggest how he tried—and, alas, failed—to apply the Baconian-Franklinian philosophy of knowledge and schooling to realize the idea of progress in 20th century society.

3. John Dewey and the Reformation of the American Public School System

During the 20th century, influential American cultural critics continuously attacked Bacon, Franklin, and Dewey as though they advocated amoral, narrowly pragmatic, technocratic, materialistic, "mechanical utilitarianism". Lewis Mumford, for example, charged that Dewey:

> . . . had succumbed to a fixation with facts at the expense of values, actualities at the expense of desires, means at the expense of ends, technique at the expense of moral imagination, invention at the expense of art, practicality at the expense of vision . . . . [Dewey was] an accomplice to the dominance in American culture of the 'utilitarian type of personality". . . [which took] values for granted and . . . [engaged] in a "one-sided idealization of practical contrivances. . . ." Dewey's pragmatism continued to bear the marks of its birth amidst "the shapelessness, the faith in the current go of things, and the general utilitarian idealism of Chicago."

The quotation above is from a highly important new book by Robert Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy.*[18] We believe (and hope) that book will accelerate the movement now underway to restore Dewey's leading role in American public philosophy. Taking note of Mumford's criticisms, Westbrook effectively refuted them. Contrary to Mumford, he ranks Dewey among:

> . . . liberal intellectuals of the twentieth century . . . [as] the most important advocate of participatory democracy, that is, of the belief that democracy as an ethical ideal calls upon men and women to build communities in which the necessary opportunities and resources are available for every individual to realize fully his or her particular capacities and powers through participation in political, social, and cultural life. This ideal rested on a "faith in the capacity of human beings for intelligent judgment and action if proper conditions are furnished," a faith, Dewey argued, "so deeply embedded in the methods which are intrinsic to democracy that when a professed democrat denies the faith he convicts himself of treachery to his profession."[19]

Among other things, Westbrook has brilliantly helped us see more clearly the centrality of Dewey's particular theory of education to his general theory of participatory democracy in modern industrial society — especially modern *American* industrial society.

American society professes to base itself on the democratic charter

myth of the Declaration of Independence. Especially in such a society, Dewey argued in effect, scientifically-grounded, democratically-inspired, community-oriented, active problem-solving, *modern schooling and learning* is indispensable if "every individual [is] to realize fully his or her particular capacities and powers through participation in political, social, and cultural life." As American public schools functioned in the late 19th and 20th centuries, however, the ardent Baconian, John Dewey, charged, they largely derived from and were dominated by ancient, scholastic, monastic, aristocratic models. In 1899, Dewey noted that a few centuries ago:

> Learning was a class matter. This was a necessary result of social conditions. There were not in existence any means by which the multitude could possibly have access to intellectual resources. These were stored up and hidden away in manuscripts. Of these there were at best only a few, and it required long and toilsome preparation to be able to do anything with them. A high-priesthood of learning, which guarded the treasury of truth and which doled it out to the masses under severe restrictions, was the inevitable expression of these conditions. . . . Our school methods, and to a very considerable extent our curriculum, are inherited from the period when learning and command of certain symbols, affording as they did the only access to learning, were all-important. *The ideals of this period are still largely in control, even where the outward methods and studies have been changed* [emphasis added]. . . our present education . . . is . . . dominated almost entirely by the medieval conception of learning.[20]

Dewey's critique of the "almost entirely medieval" American public school system had two interrelated dimensions: 1) the system was radically dysfunctional for industrially-advanced modern American society; 2) it was radically antithetical to American democratic ideals. To apply his theories and help realize his ideals, Dewey engaged in a crusade to radically transform, modernize, and democratize the American public school system. Despite minor and superficial successes (ironically, mostly in highly selective, progressive private schools), his crusade essentially failed. As a result, throughout the 20th century, American public schools have continued to fail students badly; especially students from "lower" economic and cultural strata, especially in recent decades (as James Conant warned three decades ago).

Suppose we grant the validity of Dewey's critique. We can then see that, in effect, he long ago predicted the current crises in American schools and society. To support that claim and our own "crusade" for the radical transformation of the American school system along neo-Baconian, Franklinian, Deweyan lines, we now sketch Dewey's critique of the system he viewed as "dominated almost entirely by the [aristocratic] medieval conception of learning."

In 1899, Dewey published his first major book on *The School and Society*. Summarized somewhat oversimply, one of his main propositions asserted that for social progress to occur relatively smoothly, as science develops and societies evolve economically, educational systems must evolve appropriately. Dewey invoked that proposition to explain the "modification going on in the method and curriculum of education" during the late 19th century. The "New Education" was best seen, he observed, "as part and parcel of the whole social evolution." To account for that evolution, Dewey emphasized:

> The change that comes first to mind, the one that overburdens and even controls all others, is the industrial one — the application of science resulting in the great inventions that have utilized the forces of nature on a vast and inexpensive scale: the growth of a world-wide market as the object of production, of vast manufacturing centers to supply this market, of cheap and rapid means of communication and distribution between all its parts. Even as to its feebler beginnings, this change is not much more than a century old; in many of its most important aspects it falls within the short span of those now living. One can hardly believe there has been a revolution in all history so rapid, so extensive, so complete. . . . That this revolution should not affect education in some other than a formal and superficial fashion is inconceivable.[21]

In preindustrial society, Dewey observed, "the household was practically the center in which were carried on, or about which were clustered, all the typical forms of industrial occupation." Goods that came from outside the household were:

> . . . produced in the immediate neighborhood, in shops which were constantly open to inspection and often centers of neighborhood congregation. The entire industrial process stood revealed, from the production on the farm of the raw materials until the finished article was actually put to use. Not only this, but practically every member of the household had his own share in the work. *The children, as they gained in strength and capacity, were gradually initiated into the mysteries of the several processes. It was a matter of immediate and personal concern, even to the point of actual participation* [emphasis added].
>
> We cannot overlook the factors of discipline and of character-building involved in this kind of life: Training in habits of order and of industry, and in the idea of responsibility, of obligation to do something, to produce something, in the world. . . . *Personalities which became effective in action were bred and tested in the medium of action* [emphasis added]. Again, we cannot overlook the importance for educational purposes of the close and intimate acquaintance got with nature at first hand, with real things and materials, with the actual processes of their manipulation, and the knowledge of their social necessities and uses. In all this there was continual training of observation, of ingenuity, constructive imagination, of logical thought, *and of the sense of reality acquired through first-hand contact with actualities* [emphasis added].[22]

Dewey's (idealized) analysis of the preindustrial "apprentice-like, informal natural learning system" (our term for his concept) provides the key we believe, to his prescription for reformation of the *formal* schooling system of 20th century American industrial society. He recognized, of course, that the "good old days" actually had significant costs, as well as benefits, for the education and character development of children. Together with its benefits, localism also

produced parochialism, ethnocentrism, intolerance, conformity, rigidity, narrowness of outlook, simplistic credulity. Thus he observed that the "compensations" afforded the "city-bred child of today" for the lost advantages of the rural-bred child of yesterday were:

> . . . increase in toleration, in breadth of social judgment, the larger acquaintance with human nature, the sharpened alertness in reading signs of character and interpreting social situations, greater accuracy of adaptation to differing personalities, contact with greater commercial activities. [23]

Dewey did not look backwards simply to bemoan the loss of the preindustrial informal learning system that had produced the highly desirable qualities he cited in the lengthy passage quoted above. Instead, as utopians do, he looked backwards primarily to help bring about radical changes in the existing formal schooling system. If schools were radically *and* appropriately transformed, he argued in effect, they could and would help children develop the desirable qualities of both the "country of the past" and the "city of the present and future" (our terms, not his). Put another way, good modern schools would develop in children both the desirable qualities of preindustrial society and those resulting from the economic revolution begun in the 19th century. As noted above, Dewey disdained the almost entirely medieval, formal schooling system which existed in 1899. It alarmed him, therefore, that children increasingly were subjected to that system as factories replaced households as centers of production, as work became increasingly separate and distant from home and neighborhood, as children increasingly were segregated in formal schools which isolated them from adults (other than "schoolmarms") and from community activity. In a profound sense, he viewed existing schools as unnatural institutions, i.e., contrary to human nature and daily community life.

Dewey's action-oriented theory of education logically derived from his theory of human nature. In his view, all human beings were naturally active, dynamic, experimental, goal-seeking, knowledge-seeking, world-changing, social animals. More precisely, they were *inherently capable* of engaging in purposeful, problem-solving, goal-oriented, actions to shape their environments and their lives. In favorable social contexts, in the process of active real-world problem-solving, they increase both their stock of knowledge and their ability to learn better how to learn. When freed from outmoded traditions, dogmas, and constraining or exploitative social institutions, Dewey believed, all human beings have the capacity, *if* "proper conditions are furnished" or exist, to learn continuously and engage in "intelligent judgment and action." (Hence participatory democracy as the good society.)[24]

From his theory of human nature and from his observation of children, Dewey concluded that the child was naturally curious, eager to learn how to do things, and dynamically active. But when untutored, undirected, undisciplined, the child's natural tendencies and instincts did not result in intellectual or moral development. It followed then that:

> . . . the question of education is the question of taking hold of his activities, of giving them direction. Through direction, through organized use, they tend toward valuable results, instead of scattering or being left to merely impulsive expression.[25]

In Dewey's version of preindustrial society, daily life in the household and community imposed direction, organization, and discipline on children to produce the set of desirable qualities he described so glowingly. But preindustrial society was rapidly disappearing and as societies become more complex in structure and resources, "the school must now supply that factor of training formerly taken care of in the home. . . ."[26] That is, in industrial societies, to educate children effectively means that *formal* schooling and learning must replace the *informal* learning characteristic of the past. Good schools, he argued are necessary to "direct the child's activities, giv[e] them exercise along certain lines," and produce the "discipline, culture, and information" required for intellectual, moral, and social development. To do that, good modern schools were necessary. But the existing American schools were not good modern schools. Dominated almost entirely by the medieval conception of learning, they were traditional schools.[27]

As Dewey viewed existing American schools, they were stultifying places. For various reasons and in various ways, they were structured to suppress the child's natural curiosity, eagerness to learn, dynamic activism. In a particularly powerful passage, Dewey asked his readers to visualize the "ordinary schoolroom" of "traditional education:"

> . . . with its row of ugly desks placed in geometrical order, crowded together so that there shall be as little moving room as possible, desks almost all of the same size, with just space enough to hold books, pencils, and papers, and add a table, some chairs, the bare walls, and possibly a few pictures, we can reconstruct the only educational activity that can possibly go on in such a place. It is all made "for listening" — because simply studying lessons out of a book is only another kind of listening; it marks the depending of one mind upon another. The attitude of listening means, comparatively speaking, passivity, absorption; that there are certain ready-made materials which are there, which have been prepared by the school superintendent, the board, the teacher, and of which the child is to take in as much as possible in the least possible time. . . .

Summarizing his indictment, Dewey charged that "the typical points of the old education" are:

> . . . its passivity of attitude, its mechanical massing of children, its uniformity of curriculum and method. It may be summed up by stating that the center of gravity is outside the child. It is in the teacher, the textbook, anywhere and everywhere you please except in the immediate instincts and activities of the child himself.[28]

In short, Dewey charged that the existing traditional schools were unnatural institutions which confined, repressed, and failed children rather than directed and educated them, healthily and liberally. Designed to produce passive rather than active learners, they were unwittingly programmed to cause children to fail in various ways: fail to learn what schools taught and, therefore, experience schooling as

a daily exercise in learned helplessness; fail to develop their individual talents and abilities; fail to get a good education; fail to become active, responsible, genuinely participatory members of social groups and communities. To replace traditional schools which confined, repressed and failed children, Dewey called for a radically "New Education."

In Dewey's conception, the New Education would combine the advantages of the preindustrial informal learning system with the advantages provided by formal schools organized according to the new "functional psychology" and "instrumentalist theory of knowledge" he was developing. Given his Baconian experimental orientation, in 1894-1896, to test and develop his ideas, Dewey organized the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago.[29] It quickly attracted favorable attention. Publication of *School and Society* in 1899 "added immeasurably to the fame of the school and spread Dewey's ideas to a worldwide audience."[30]

Basically, the Laboratory School curriculum was sequentially organized around the history of American economic development. Proceeding from the early grades, children in effect *recapitulated in school* the history of occupations that American had *practiced in society* from colonial days to the present. That is, consonant with Dewey's commitment to active rather than passive learning, as children advanced from grade to grade, they not only studied but "actually practiced" (in a very limited way, of course) the main occupations characteristic of successive generations of American society.

Radically opposed to the child "listening" and "teacher talk" (to use a current term) orientation of traditional schools, the Laboratory School was organized around children working at practical occupations. The purpose, Dewey emphasized, was not "manual training" or "vocational training." In the passage quoted below, Dewey summarized the theory of formal education developed and practiced in his Laboratory School:

> The great thing to keep in mind, then, regarding the introduction into the school [i.e., schools in general] of various forms of active occupation, is that through them the entire spirit of the school is renewed. It has a chance to affiliate itself with life, to become the child's habitat, where he learns through directed living, instead of being only a place to learn lessons having an abstract and remote reference to some possible to be done in the future. *It gets a chance to be a miniature community, an embyonic society* [emphasis added]. This is the fundamental fact, and from this arise continuous and orderly streams of instruction.
>
> . . . out of the occupation, out of doing things that are to produce results, and out of doing these in a social and cooperative way, there is born a discipline of its own kind and type. Our whole conception of school discipline changes when we get this point of view. In critical moments we all realize that the only discipline that stands by us, the only training that becomes intuition, is that got through life itself. That we learn from experience, and from books or the sayings of others only as they are related to experience, are not mere phrases.[31]

In this essay, we need not present a detailed critique of Dewey's program to radically transform American public schools. For our purposes, we need only note that his Laboratory School did not practically solve the problems he brilliantly posed, namely: how to help children learn by "do[ing] things with a real motive behind and a real outcome ahead"; how to connect effectively what children did in school with what they did outside of school; how to connect effectively schools and real-world daily community life; how to combine effectively the advantages of the informal preindustrial learning system with those which could result from a modern, cosmopolitan, experimental, activity-based, formal schooling system; how to minimize each system's particular disadvantages.

The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago was just that, an unnatural, artificial, *university laboratory* isolated from American life as it really was lived or really had been lived. Rather than functioning as a laboratory which experimentally studied the complex links between school and society, the Laboratory School was effectively isolated from the American society in which its pupils really lived. In contrast, the informal learning system of preindustrial society was deeply rooted in, functioned as an integral part of, the local geographic community in which children lived and their families made their livings. Unlike the real occupations that children worked at in preindustrial communities, unlike the real problems they solved with real consequences, the occupations students "practiced" in the Laboratory School were *simulated* occupations, the problems they solved were *simulated* problems unconnected to real contemporary community problems. The school was—and only could be—a *simulated* community, not a real "miniature community" or "embryonic society." It did not practically connect school and society, it created a radical disjunction between them.

By its very nature, the Laboratory School was remarkably unrepresentative of American public schools as they were, or as they possibly could be in the foreseeable future. Even if it did work well for its students, the model it developed could not be adapted to work well for the great majority of students in American public schools.

As Robert Westbrook has observed, most Laboratory School "students were from professional families, many of them the children of Dewey's colleagues." To practice "Deweyan pedagogy" effectively in the simulated world of the Laboratory School, teachers had "to be highly skilled professionals, thoroughly knowledgeable in the subject matter they were teaching, trained in child psychology, and skilled in the techniques of providing the stimulus necessary to make the subject matter part of a child's growing experience."[32] That the world-famous Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, directed by the world-famous John Dewey, with a highly selective student body, could find and develop teachers like that did not mean that American public schools generally could do anything like that.

Bluntly stated, one main reason that Dewey's crusade to transform the American public school system failed was because the *specific solution* he proposed was, at bottom, remarkably scholastic, academic, impractical, unrealistic. We underscore *specific solution* because we strongly agree with his *general* theories, propositions, and orientation. *Appropriately applied*, we are convinced, Dewey's general ideas are highly practical. Appropriately applied, as we try to show below, they can radically transform contemporary American public schools for the better.

Public schools should be—and can be—community institutions where students actively, constructively, engage in real-world problem-solving that has real, visible, beneficial, significant consequences for themselves, their families, their neighbors, their communities. But the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago which pretended to recapitulate the history of American economic development and society was not such a school. It was a pseudo-community, not an integral part of a real American community. At the risk of engaging in academic oneupmanship, we think we pay homage to Dewey when we try to transcend him and propose development of *Cosmopolitan, Community-Centered, Community Problem-Solving, Community Action-Oriented, Community-Serving, Public Schools*. Such schools, we believe, would realize what Dewey envisioned when he nostalgically looked backwards to the informal learning system he recalled from his own preindustrial childhood in Burlington, Vermont, and sought to retain its benefits in a modern formal schooling system appropriate for the industrial society and global economy of the 20th century.

4. University-Assisted, Staff-Controlled and Managed, Cosmopolitan, Community-Centered, Community Problem-Solving, Community Action-Oriented, Community-Serving, Public Schools.

Our lengthy heading, we trust, suggests the main characteristics of the Neo-Deweyan public schools we envision developing in the 1990s. For brevity's sake, we will refer to them as *cosmopolitan community schools*. As we conceive cosmopolitan community schools, the term is not oxymoronic.

Cosmopolitan and community-minded (or *localistic*) can be (and have been) treated as polar opposites on a continuum. Community "influentials" have been dichotomized, for example, as having either *cosmopolitan* or *local* orientations and labelled accordingly, *cosmopolitans* and *locals*.[33]

Cosmopolitan-minded and community-minded, however, are not intrinsically contradictory qualities. Granted, a tension tends to exist between them. But cosmopolitans need not be *rootless* cosmopolitans. Some are, of course, e.g., some intellectuals deliberately avoid, deliberately deny local roots. Nevertheless, other cosmopolitans are *community-rooted*. That is, they *simultaneously*: a) have firm bases in, attachments to, identifications with particular geographic communities; b) regard themselves as "citizens of the world;" c) aspire to practice and help achieve universal humane values, contribute to the "relief of man's estate," the "betterment of humanity."

To believe that cosmopolitan community schools are both highly desirable and realistically possible, as we do, does not mean we believe they are easily established. We do not. To establish them—as we have been learning in practice—will take some doing. But they can *only* be established if proponents clearly, strongly, see the need to do so and then work hard, long, and skillfully to do so. As Francis Bacon emphasized long ago, it is "not possible to run a course aright when the goal itself is not rightly placed." Dewey's educational crusade failed, we are convinced, because (among other reasons) he failed to apply that Baconian proposition to his pedagogical work at the University of Chicago from 1894 to 1904.

Suppose Dewey had *clearly* seen that what he really wanted to do was to radically transform the "almost entirely medieval" traditional American public school system into a modern cosmopolitan community school system. He then would not have constructed the Laboratory School. Instead, he would have worked with real schools in real communities—or perhaps tried to establish a *new public school which drew its students from, and actually served, a real community*.

To produce the benefits Dewey believed children got from the informal learning system of preindustrial communities, schools must be deeply, widely, rooted in real communities. That is why we think it reasonable to claim that Dewey only *vaguely, unsystematically*, envisioned developing the cosmopolitan community schools which we regard both as appropriate and functional for 20th century American democratic industrial society and logically derivable from his general theories and propositions.

Our neo-Baconian, neo-Franklinian, neo-Deweyan goal is to help transform the American public school system into a highly decentralized, functionally integrated, system of cosmopolitan community schools. Once that goal is clearly seen and stated, of course, a whole set of complex questions "spring" to mind. To list only a few:

1. What precisely do we mean by cosmopolitan community schools?
2. In respect to "daytime" students, how would such schools be organized and what would their curriculum be?
3. As community centers, what specifically would they do?
4. How would they be funded and staffed?
5. How would they be physically "laid out" to conduct multiple operations effectively?
6. Why don't they—or something like them—now exist?
7. To what extent have attempts been made in the past to create them?
8. If such attempts have been made, why didn't they succeed?
9. What obstacles now exist to their creation, development, and maintenance?
10. What practical strategy would be likely to help us "get from here to there," from the American public school system as it is now to the American public school system as we think it should be?

The set of questions can be usefully divided into two main categories: 1) What radical changes should be made in the American public school system? What would modern cosmopolitan community schools "look like," "do?" 2) What strategy is likely to bring about such a radically transformed public school system? That is, what strategy is likely to bring about the desired changes really, fundamentally, comprehensively, systematically, rather than rhetorically, superficially, partially, contradictorily?

The second category of questions, we believe, are by far the hardest to answer. "Reformers" generally, academic reformers particularly, tend strongly to avoid answering practical strategy questions of that type—or at best answer them only vaguely or unconvincingly. To highlight their importance, we now focus on practical strategy. In the next section, we use a concrete example of a community school in the making in West Philadelphia to indicate what such schools might "look like" and do.

In the lengthy heading for this section, the first term is *university-*

assisted. Among other reasons, we place that term first because university assistance is the key to our strategy for establishing a functionally integrated, decentralized system of American cosmopolitan community schools. To establish such schools, we believe, requires appropriate major assistance from American universities—broadly conceived to include colleges. (Why we believe that proposition to be valid is the subject for another lengthy essay.)

As American universities are now oriented and function, of course, they will not and cannot provide the appropriate major assistance we believe needed to radically transform American public schools. What reason exists then to think that universities are likely to change appropriately? To answer that question adequately would take another long book; here we answer it in oversimplified form. During the 1990s, American universities are likely to make the changes in their relationships to public schools that we think they should make because: 1) their *institutional self-interest* will compel them to do so; 2) they will increasingly, though reluctantly, come to see that.

Somewhat more specifically, our Neo-Deweyan argument takes this form: Unless the American public school system is radically transformed for the better, the crisis in American cities (and society) is insoluble; it will only get worse, at an accelerating rate. If the post-1945 crisis of American cities continues, accelerates, and deepens, American universities, directly and indirectly, will increasingly be affected badly. For a variety of complex reasons, in a variety of complex ways, their capacity to carry out their self-professed missions, advancing and transmitting knowledge, will diminish seriously—at an accelerating rate. To prevent that from happening, therefore, we maintain and predict, universities will make it a major priority to help transform the American public school system. To illustrate—not "prove"—our argument, we use the example with which we are most familiar, our own university—Ben Franklin's (partially realized) Academy in Philadelphia, 250 years later.

Like many American universities in 1991, Penn is located in a poverty-stricken, increasingly pathological, "inner-city ghetto," West Philadelphia, a section of the city of Philadelphia. West Philadelphia today is precisely the type of urban area that James Conant warned in 1961 was accumulating "social dynamite"—the type of area likely to explode disastrously unless urban public schools were radically reconstructed.

It is instructive to note that West Philadelphia was not always the way it is now. In 1872, when Penn tried to escape the "evils" of Philadelphia by moving its campus west across the Schuykill River, it moved to an exurban area safely distant from, isolated from, the crime, violence, depravity, disorder, dirt, noise, pollution, of rapidly industrializing Philadelphia. Like other American urban universities (e.g., Columbia, Chicago) during the late 19th and 20th centuries, however, Penn only succeeded in escaping from the city for a few decades.

Removed from the city, Penn's administrators and faculty concentrated their energies and resources on massively building its physical plant and becoming a major research university. Meanwhile, the city expanded, outflanked and surrounded the university. After World War I, particularly after World War II, West Philadelphia was transformed; it increasingly became the inner-city ghetto that it is today. As a result, Penn increasingly has experienced the great and varied costs and stresses of trying to perform its traditional academic functions in an increasingly difficult, hostile, threatening, unsafe, physical and social "environment"—an "environment" which can neither be blocked from view by ivied walls and multistoried dormitories nor protected against by an increasingly professional, armed, omnipresent, and *expensive* Department of Public Saftey. After dark today, most Penn buildings are either locked, essentially unused, or carefully guarded; a volunteer "town watch" patrols the streets outside the campus "perimeter;" and Penn personnel are instructed to take all the precautions appropriate for people living in an urban "danger zone." In short, like many American universities, Penn has increasingly been affected adversely by the multiple problems of existence in a highly alienating, highly dangerous urban environment.

At various times during the 20th century, Penn did attempt to minimize the costs and increase the benefits of its urban location. Such attempts tended to be sporadic and given very low priority, however, until 1981. In that year, Sheldon Hackney became President. Since then, to improve its "environment," i.e., improve the quality of life in its geographic community, Penn has increasingly tried to counter the powerful, complex, negative "forces" producing severe deterioration in Philadelphia (and almost all American cities). On balance, it has not succeeded. In 1991, West Philadelphia constitutes a much more unfavorable, much more threatening, environment for a major research university than it did in 1981.

In 1991, Penn is doing much more than it did in 1981 to overcome the deterioration of its geographic community. But it is still losing the battle—and at an accelerating rate. In complex, interactive, direct and indirect ways, losing that "environmental" battle adversely effects the university now and threatens to do so to a much greater extent in the future. For obvious reasons, Penn cannot again try to escape the city by moving out, as it did in 1872. What then, if anything, is it to do to reverse the accelerating deterioration of its geographic environment?

Penn is not, cannot be, should not try to be, either a community college or a community service station. It regards itself—and passionately wants to be regarded—as a world-class university. To be able to function as a world-class university in the future, however, Penn must now *really*, *profoundly*, *comprehensively*, grasp this "fact of life:" it must radically change its orientation to, its relationships with West Philadelphia in particular and Philadelphia in general. That, we contend, is simply a fact of life for Penn (and for all similarly situated universities in respect to their own communities). To some extent, of course, "life" has indeed been teaching that lesson to Penn. As evidence, we cite a formal document of considerable significance, the university's official *Annual Report* for 1987-1988.

Entitled, *Penn and Philadelphia: Common Ground, the Report* focused on the dynamic, mutually beneficial interaction which potentially exists between Penn and its local community. Since elite private American research universities like Penn have notoriously tended to consider themselves *in* but not *of* their local communities, since town-gown conflict has deep-rooted causes and a centuries-old history, that focus itself was highly significant. Even more significant was the *Report's* explicit recognition that Penn's future and the future of Philadelphia were inextricably tied together. After summarizing some of the university's recent efforts, President Hackney wrote:

> The picture that emerges is one of a relationship in which the University and the City are important to one another. We stand

on common ground, our futures very much intertwined.[34]

Implicit in Hackney's official statement was recognition that Penn can no longer try to remain an oasis of affluence in a desert of urban despair. Logically at least, that recognition should lead to a radical change in institutional orientation and acceptance of this proposition: the problems of its local community, *no matter what the causes of those problems*, are simultaneously the problems of the university. Given that radically changed orientation, efforts to solve community problems would no longer be viewed either as a minor matter or a matter of moral choice. Instead they would become—more precisely, *should* become—an institutional imperative. Stated in more theoretical terms, the argument takes this form: As is generally true of "open systems," Penn's environment significantly affects its functioning. If its environment deteriorates badly, it must seriously devote its resources (broadly conceived) to reversing that deterioration—or suffer the consequences.

In one sense, for Penn to focus seriously on the effective application of its resources to the problems of its city, would simply represent its rededication to a tradition begun 250 years ago by its patron saint, Benjamin Franklin. It is not the Franklin tradition, however, that we are invoking here. Wholly aside from that tradition, we contend, even in terms of narrow self-interest alone, for its present and future institutional well-being, it is imperative that Penn now seriously work to help solve its West Philadelphia-Philadelphia problem. Penn imperatively needs to solve that problem. But can it really do that? How? A hard—terribly hard—question. It is not primarily a matter of institutional will, we believe, it is primarily a matter of institutional knowledge.

Necessity does not necessarily mother successful invention. We do not believe that Penn—or any similarly situated American university—now really knows how to transform itself so that it can perform its professed missions of advancing and transmitting knowledge and *simultaneously* help solve its local "environmental" problem. It does not. *The crucial point is that Penn has officially come to recognize that it must really try hard to learn how to do that.* Our Deweyan argument is that the best way Penn can learn to do what it must do is to engage in reflective real-world action. More specifically, our *Neo-Deweyan* (in several senses) argument is that the best way Penn can learn how to appropriately transform itself is to begin by trying to help transform the existing dysfunctional West Philadelphia public school system into a modern system of university-assisted, cosmopolitan community schools.

To clarify and support our argument, we put it in a larger context. Our *university transformation by real-world doing* proposition derives from our general strategy for the improvement of social science.

As social science research is presently conducted, it can be divided into two main types: 1) *Scholastic Social Science*, or "pure social science"; 2) *Action Social Science*, or "applied social science."

Scholastic Social Science is by far the dominant type of research preached and practiced today. Radically anti-Baconian, anti-Franklinian, anti-Deweyan, it is primarily contemplative, abstract, scientistic, anti-historical. Pathetically, embarrassingly imitative of 19th century positivist physical science, Scholastic Social Science is highly dysfunctional for the advancement of knowledge and the "betterment of humanity." We regard it is as a burden to be overcome, not a resource that can be used to do good work(s). In contrast, we believe that Action Social Science, because (among other reasons) it is not contemplative and abstract but reflective and real-world action oriented, has much greater inherent capacity to advance knowledge and increase human well-being.

Our simple dichotomous typology, of course, actually poses many complex conceptual (and other) problems. No matter. For our present purposes, it is enough to say that *Scholastic* social research is conducted (almost) exclusively by professional social scientists and is not action-oriented; it is discipline/academic world-oriented, not real-world oriented. Its solipsistic concern is the Academy, not the world in which human beings actually live and die. In direct contrast, as our label suggests, *Action* social research is action and real-world oriented. Because it is comprehensive in nature, however, it can be usefully divided into three main subtypes. To suggest their main differentiating characteristics, we label them: Type A) professional expert action social science; Type B) participatory action social science; Type C) communal participatory action social science.

As the labels suggest, Type A differs the most from Types B and C. Type A research projects are conducted *by* professional experts *for* "clients" who do little in the research process other than specify the practical problem(s) they want solved and provide research funds and other resources (e.g., access to personnel, documents, sites). In contrast, both Type B and C projects require continuous, comprehensive, collaboration between members of the "entity" being studied (e.g., organization, group, community) and one or more professional social researchers. By continuous, comprehensive collaboration we mean that *genuinely collaborative interaction* occurs in all stages of the research process "from the initial design to the final presentation of results and discussion of their action implications."[35]

What differentiates Type B (participatory action social research) from Type C (communal participatory action social research)? As we conceive them, to begin with, they differ in the geographic location of the sites at which research is conducted. Much more significantly, they differ in the extent to which the professional social researcher's university has an explicit, direct institutional stake in solving the problems(s) being studied.

Type B projects can be conducted by professional social researchers anywhere in the world, without regard to the location of the researcher's university. (Have skills, will travel.) Moreover, the success or failure of Type B projects do not matter to the researcher's university *as an institution*—except in the highly limited sense, of course, that universities have an interest in the success of projects conducted by their individual members (or specialized units).

In contrast, Type C collaborative projects are conducted by professional researchers in the geographic community in which their university is located. Among many other advantages, geographic proximity permits creative faculty members to combine effectively their research and their teaching to give their students significant, responsible "hands-on learning" experience. And as suggested above, to a significant extent at least, Type C projects, if successful, are likely to benefit the professional researcher's university in a direct institutional sense. In effect, the researcher's university is one of the "clients" for whom and by whom Type C projects are conducted and supported. Put another way, the professional researcher's university is an integral part of the community which is likely to benefit from the success of

Type C projects—hence the label, *communal* participatory action research. As a result, a university's resources are much more likely to be available on a generous, continuous, long-term basis to its members who conduct Type C projects than to its members who conduct either Type B or A projects. Among many other reasons, other things being roughly equal, that is why we believe Type C projects are inherently more likely to be continuous, interdisciplinary, interrelated, and sufficiently long-term to be successful than are Type B (or Type A) projects conducted by members of the same university.

From that typology of social scientific research, we have derived a strategy designed to help Penn go about the long, slow, painful process of overcoming the burdens of history and tradition and learning how to carry out its missions of advancing and transmitting knowledge while simultaneously trying to solve its West Philadelphia-Philadelphia environmental problem. Stated oversimply, that strategy calls for Penn to create and develop a permanent, major *natural laboratory* focused on the "geographic community" of West Philadelphia in all its aspects, e.g., social, cultural, physical, biological. (We place "geographic community" in quotation marks because West Philadelphia, as it *now* exists, is not really a *community*; it is more accurately viewed as a geographic *area* of Philadelphia with a population aggregating nearly a quarter of a million people.)

To avoid misunderstanding, we emphasize that, unlike scholastic social researchers who study particular communities simply as "good" sources of data, the strategy we propose in no way envisions Penn treating West Philadelphia as a laboratory for academic experts to experiment on poor people—a convenient site for study rather than a population requiring neighborly assistance. On the contrary. Our strategy assumes that in any decision to undertake a specific West Philadelphia project, *the primary criterion* would be the likelihood that it would contribute to the well-being of the people being studied, at least some of whom, to the optimum extent appropriate, would participate collaboratively in all stages of the research process. Changing West Philadelphia for the better in specific respects and doing good participatory action research *which advances general knowledge*, our strategy assumes, can be and should be dynamically interactive, highly complementary goals.

Building on insights from the work of John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and William Foote Whyte on participatory action research, our strategy emphasizes a mutually-beneficial, democratic relationship between academics and non-academics. In that relationship, academic researchers learn from *and* with members of the community, research *with* and not *on* people, contribute simultaneously to the solution of *significant community problems and significant scholarly problems*.[36] In short, we believe that, creatively conceived, West Philadelphia can function as the site of a Neo-Baconian *natural laboratory* for the systemically-integrated production and use of knowledge, i.e., a natural laboratory in which communal participatory action research operates as an effective *humanistic* strategy for the dynamically-interactive advancement of knowledge and human welfare.

It is important to note that our proposed strategy for Penn in the 1990s does not only derive from our general orientation to social science and our study of the literature on participatory action research. Directly and indirectly, it also derives from our critical reflections on a specific participatory action project we (and other Penn faculty) have been engaged in for several years. Though it did not begin that way, the particular focus of the project *evolved* into the development of a university-assisted, cosmopolitan community school in West Philadelphia. To suggest the evolutionary nature of the process and illustrate and clarify our proposed strategy for Penn, we now sketch a brief history of that project.

5. The John C. Turner Middle School in West Philadelphia: A University-Assisted, Cosmopolitan Community School in the Making

> Thinking begins in what may fairly enough be called a *forked-road* situation, a situation which is ambiguous, which presents a dilemma, which proposes alternatives. As long as our activity glides smoothly along from one thing to another, or as long as we permit our imagination to entertain fancies at pleasure, there is no call for reflection. Difficulty or obstruction in the way of reaching a belief brings us, however, to a pause. . . .
>
> *Demand for the solution of a perplexity is the steadying and guiding factor in the entire process of reflection.* . . . a question to be answered, an ambiguity to be resolved, sets up an end and holds the current of ideas to a definite channel. . . .
>
> [In summary] . . . the origin of thinking is some perplexity, confusion, or doubt. Thinking is not a case of spontaneous combustion; it does not occur just on "general principles". There is something specific which occasions and invokes it.
>
> John Dewey
> *How We Think* (1910)

During the past few years, we have increasingly benefitted from Dewey's analysis of the thinking process. It has helped us see more clearly the utility of consciously, continually, working to translate general orientations or abstract "scholarly" problems into specific problems which present practical difficulties or obstacles requiring specific solutions. Our general problem has remained fairly constant—how to improve Penn's geographic environment. While trying to solve that problem, however, we have found it both necessary and (relatively) easier to be constantly self-reflective, "firmly flexible" on the choice of specific problems and the priorities assigned them.

To suggest the evolving process, we begin by observing that the project to help create university-assisted, cosmopolitan community schools in West Philadelphia did not start as a project to do anything like that. In complex ways which were not consciously planned or even generally foreseen, the West Philadelphia school project resulted from the decision we and Sheldon Hackney (an American history professor before he became a university president) made to give an honors seminar for Penn undergraduates in the Spring 1985 semester. The title of the seminar expressed our general concerns: "Urban University-Community Relationships: Penn-West Philadelphia, Past, Present, and Future, as a Case Study."

By the mid-1980s, West Philadelphia was rapidly deteriorating. What should Penn do to remedy its "environmental situation?" That

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

seemed to us to be a good question for Penn undergraduates to think about and propose solutions to in the process of learning better how to do independent research designed to better society. Moreover, it also seemed to be a good action-oriented, personally relevant question to stimulate Penn undergraduates to think seriously about abstract, high-level questions such as "Why Study History?", "Knowledge for What?", "What are Universities Good For?". How to stimulate students to do that had long been a question that concerned—and perplexed—us. In retrospect, of course, we now see that the decision to organize the Urban University-Community Relationships seminar exemplified Dewey's proposition that "thinking begins in a *forked-road* situation"—a proposition, we confess, of which we were ignorant at the time we acted on it.

As the 1985 seminar was organized, each student focused his or her research on a more-or-less specific problem which adversely affected specific groups in West Philadelphia. During the course of the semester, four students who had begun independent projects decided to work cooperatively to study the problem of youth unemployment in the context of improving the West Philadelphia physical environment. Having done library research, consulted experts in Philadelphia and elsewhere, and interviewed leaders of local groups, they developed a proposal to create a "better and less expensive" youth corps than existed anywhere else, including the federal government's Job Corps. More specifically they proposed a neighborhood-based, neighborhood-improving, summer job-training program for at-risk youth. Built into their proposal, however, was the possibility of expanding it to include adults—as well as volunteers concerned with neighborhood improvement. To suggest the comprehensive nature and multiple objectives of the proposed program, therefore, they called for creation of a West Philadelphia Improvement Corps, or WEPIC. WEPIC constituted a "neat" acronym which has been retained and remains appropriate, though it now identifies a radically different project than was originally envisioned.

For a variety of complex reasons (including some that were wholly accidental), it became possible to obtain funds to actually implement the proposed youth job-training program during the summer of 1985. Contrary to the original plan, however, much of the summer activity became focused around a neighborhood elementary school—the Bryant School.

To remove graffiti and improve Bryant's physical appearance, murals were painted around the school building and a near-by daycare center. With the help of a Penn landscape architect and Penn undergraduates serving as summer interns, a comprehensive landscaping plan for the weed-and rubbish-filled school grounds was drafted and partially implemented. Trees, shrubs, grass, and ground-cover were planted, brick walks were constructed, benches set in place, and a general clean-up and area improvement occurred.

As work proceeded on the school building and grounds, neighbors reacted positively, provided some volunteer help, and undertook improvement projects on their own properties. From the positive reactions of the neighbors, Penn faculty and students began to see that public schools might effectively function as centers both for youth work experience and for neighborhood revitalization. As a result, during the Fall of 1985, WEPIC became an extracurricular after-school program at Bryant. Significantly (in retrospect), some of the teachers, to a limited extent, more-or-less spontaneously, linked the after-school projects to their teaching during the day, e.g., to math and science classes.

From the Bryant elementary school, WEPIC spread over the next five years to a large comprehensive high school, three middle schools, and two other elementary schools. It is currently a year-round school and neighborhood revitalization program involving nearly a thousand students, their parents, and community members in education, cultural, recreation, job training and community improvement and service activities.

Not for purposes of institutional self-aggrandizement but to help specify our general strategy for university-assisted reconstruction of the American public school system, we note that increasing assistance from Penn, in an increasing variety of ways, has been, remains, and probably will remain, critical to the growth and development of WEPIC. It is also important to note, however, that though WEPIC began that way, it is no longer primarily a Penn-dominated enterprise. The program is now administratively coordinated by the West Philadelphia Partnership, a mediating organization composed of West Philadelphia institutions (including Penn) and community groups, in conjunction with the Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition and Philadelphia School District. Other participants in the cooperative enterprise include trade unions, job training agencies, city, state and federal agencies and departments, churches, and neighborhood groups. A central administrative staff exists but program activity is highly decentralized. Although some functions are centrally conducted (e.g., fundraising), to the optimum extent possible, each WEPIC school operates autonomously.[37]

In sketching (and oversimplifying) the complex process that shaped the development of WEPIC and our evolving strategy for Penn, we must emphasize our unwitting reinvention of "community schools." As WEPIC increasingly became a school-based program and as the teachers in the program expanded their roles to encompass community improvement and engagement, we increasingly saw that schools could function as the catalytic strategic agent for community revitalization. That is, as the program evolved, the initial problem of youth unemployment became subsumed under a far more comprehensive and significant problem. How can schools effectively function as genuine community centers for the organization, education, and transformation of an entire neighborhood?

Since the late 19th century, particularly since 1899 when John Dewey powerfully focused attention on the relationships between *School and Society*, there have been significant attempts, indeed movements, to have American public schools function as community centers. During the first two decades of the 20th century, community schools increasingly were advocated as strategic agencies to cope with educational and societal problems. Probably the premier example of an urban, action-oriented community school was Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem, New York City.[38]

Created in 1934 by an Italian-born immigrant, Leonard Covello, and directed by him until 1956, the aptly-named Benjamin Franklin High School functioned, to a considerable extent, as a multiservice, integrative, community-oriented institution linking the schools' academic curriculum to community service and community revitalization. Its action-orientation involved students in the study and resolution of community problems, first in East Harlem's Italian neighborhoods and later, as the demographics changed, in Black and Hispanic

neighborhoods. That splendid historical example *should* have served as a model for what Penn and West Philadelphia schools were trying to do from 1985 on. In any event, it did not.

Benjamin Franklin High did not serve as a model for us when we began working with West Philadelphia schools because we did not know it had existed. We were American historians but we were only dimly aware of community schools in general and certainly had no idea of their importance in 20th century American school and social history. Our ignorance reflected the historical literature. Despite the real significance of community schools in the *real world* of American educational history, they had essentially been given very short shrift and relegated to footnote status in the *academic world* of American educational history (i.e., historiography).

As we increasingly became engaged with West Philadelphia teachers and principals in an action research project, we turned our attention to John Dewey on schooling and learning. In turn, reading Dewey led us to search actively for the primary and (highly specialized) secondary literature dealing with the "wider use" of schools as "social centers" and "community centers." A genuine sense of intellectual excitement developed as Penn academics and West Philadelphia school practitioners learned about historical antecedents to their (improvised) efforts. It located them in a larger tradition, helped them draw inspiration from previous attempts, and learn from past successes and failures—and from past reflections on those successes and failures. Most critically, the "discovery" of community schools in American educational history helped Penn academics and West Philadelphia practitioners better understand what we all had been groping toward conceptually, theoretically, and practically.

The term "community school," of course, is far from self-explanatory; indeed, we quickly discovered that it means radically different things to different people. One meaning includes *community control* of public schools—a meaning strongly associated with the violence and teachers' union strike which tore apart the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district in New York City in 1967-1968. Community control of public schools *a` la`* New York City (or Chicago) is emphatically *not* what we mean to denote or connote when we advocate "cosmopolitan community schools." To help suggest what we do mean, we will quote a lengthy definition given in *The Community School*, the yearbook published in 1953 by the National Society for the Study of Education. Before doing so, however, we briefly sketch the European origins of the community school movements. For reasons suggested below that historical sketch has more than mere historical interest.[39]

As a result of the economic revolution of the late 18th and 19th centuries, an increasing number of "thinkers advanced . . . ideas concerning the interdependence of the community and the school." According to one historian of the movement, the first community school "in the 'modern manner'" was begun in Switzerland in 1806. It "demonstrated in a limited manner what could be done through a *direct attack by the school on local needs and problems* [emphasis added]." The Swiss experiment with community schools "attracted wide attention . . . . numerous official commissions inspected. . . [the site] and carried back to their own countries many of the ideas which they saw implemented [there]. . . . " But the experiment was not institutionalized and primarily represented the work of a single dedicated visionary. When he died in 1844, "his ideas were soon discontinued. The view of the close relationship of education and the improvement of living which he held was ahead of his time."

During the mid-19th century, a somewhat independent development of the community school idea occurred in Denmark. In marked contrast to the Swiss experiment, it was institutionalized with far more lasting results. For a variety of reasons, "folk high schools" had been created which emphasized Danish history and mythology to "Awaken `national spirit'. . . [and] arouse a determination to improve life for all." Though they retained their "folk" character, those schools were radically changed in the 1860s and 1870s to cope with the economic crisis resulting from the combined effects of the Prussian war with Denmark, the rapid development of an international grain market, and the sudden emergence of the United States and Argentina as exporters of cheap grain. Since the Danish economy:

> . . . had rested upon the exportation and sale of grain crops, it became necessary for Denmark to choose between attempts to meet the new world competition and the establishment of new industries. At this time the folk schools changed their earlier emphasis upon the romantic approach to Danish folk lore and history to one of serious consideration of the economic problems facing the people. . . [the schools helped foster] the decision to turn from a grain economy to a dairy economy. . . . In addition to the older instruction on Danish mythology, the folk high schools gave increasing attention to national problems in the field of economics and sociology. Among the outcomes was the rapid growth of co-operatives which developed later due to the large number of small individually owned farms which made co-operative marketing and purchasing desirable. . . . The importance of these schools cannot be overemphasized. . . . "The Government says in an official bulletin that these schools have made the Danish people intelligent enough to create and operate successfully the several vast co-operative enterprises of the nation and to govern their own affairs and manage their own interest in a discriminatory manner."

Having explained the European origins of community schools as a response to national economic and social crisis, and cited Denmark as a highly successful, concrete demonstration of their power to solve crises and increase societal well-being, the historian quoted above then generalized his analysis:

> The growing impact upon community life of the technological and scientific advances of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has resulted in a broadening and deepening of the community-school concept.

In the same volume on *The Community School*, one chapter focused on "The Community School Defined." Noting the "variety of programs offered by community schools," the authors presented a "definition which is universal in scope and adaptable to any social, economic, or political setting." We quote it in full:

> A community school is a school which has concerns beyond the training of literate, "right-minded," and economically efficient citizens who reflect the values and processes of a particu-

lar social, economic, and political setting. In addition to these basic educational tasks, it is *directly concerned with improving all aspects of living in the community* in all the broad meaning of that concept, in the local, state, regional, national, or international community. To attain that end, the community school is *consciously used* by the people of the community. Its curriculum reflects planning to meet the discovered needs of the community with changes in emphasis as circumstances indicate. Its buildings and physical facilities are at once a center for both youth and adults who together are actively engaged in analyzing problems suggested by the needs of the community and in formulating and exploring solutions to those problems. Finally, the community school is concerned that the people put solutions into operation to the end that living is improved and enriched for *the individual and the community* [emphasis added].[40]

In its summary chapter, *The Community School* explicitly answered critics who contended that community schools with their "emphasis upon local problems and local resources. . . develop an insular state of mind that seriously limits the development of both the individual and the community." The contrary was true. Community schools not only emphasized the interdependency of the community and the school, "they emphasize the interdependence of communities." To quote the authors:

> These critics do not understand that inherent in the community-school program are many concerns with the relationships of the community to larger geographic areas. The school, in the study of community problems and resources, develops the idea that each community is one interdependent part of a larger whole, each a part of a region with related problems, and each region part of a nation. The community-school program develops understandings of man's relationship to the world.[41]

To convey that anti-parochial idea, we have thought it useful to coin the term, *cosmopolitan community school.*

At this point, skeptical readers might well ask: "If cosmopolitan community schools really hold such great promise and have been advocated for so long, why don't they now exist in American practice?" An excellent question. To answer it, (among other reasons), we are writing a book on "The Rise, Fall, and Revitalization of American Community Schools, 1886-2000." In it, we will discuss in detail the complex set of obstacles that to-date have prevented significant American realization of the "community school idea" — other than in the form of isolated, relatively short-lived experiments. Obviously, we believe those obstacles are not insurmountable. Since it seems necessary, however, to indicate to our present readers that reasonable grounds exist for our belief, as well as to suggest more concretely what a community school would do or "look like," we now discuss the "organizational and governance obstacle" briefly and the "resources obstacle" somewhat more fully.

In noting our strong opposition to *community control* of schools *a'la'* Ocean Hill-Brownsville, we have already alluded to one key aspect of community school governance. Community schools are designed to carry out far more functions and serve far wider constituencies than existing "conventional" public schools. In their operations, therefore, unlike conventional schools, they must significantly involve community members, representatives of community groups, and representatives of other organizations which provide resources to carry out nontraditional school-based activities. Far more easily said than done, of course—as we have painfully learned during the past few years and as our critical analysis of the history of American community school experiments has clearly shown us.

"Who governs" and "how" are far more difficult questions for community schools than for *factory model*, hierarchically-organized, conventional public schools. For community schools, no "one best system" is even conceivable, let alone workable. Different communities, different organizational and governance structures. That proposition seems (almost) self-evident to us.

Different communities require different community school organizational and governance structures. Having said and meant that, we believe, however, that we can specify some good general principles. Perhaps the most significant principle is this: In any effective community school, *site-based* professional educators must lead the entire effort and be at the *core* of the governance structure. That is what we mean to convey by the phrase, *staff-controlled and managed community schools*. But how to put that general principle into concrete effective practice provides a splendid example of what Dewey calls a "*forked-road* situation." It requires very hard thought, very skillful and persistent work—and we are now only in the early stages of that process.

Stated in general terms, construction of a decentralized system of staff-controlled and managed community schools requires *appropriate* changes in the training and attitudes of professional educators, *appropriate* changes in the organizational structure and culture of public schools, *appropriate* changes in the relationships of individual schools with school districts, state departments of education, etc., appropriate changes in parental participation in school governance. But what *specifically* would *appropriate* changes mean? That, of course, is a very large topic. Here we can only discuss it briefly by giving a specific example of what we now believe would be an appropriate change in the organizational structure of public schools.

From our analysis of the literature on past attempts to create community schools, reflections on our real-world experiences with West Philadelphia schools, and reading in the social science literature on theories of "workplace democracy" and "participatory management," we have derived this proposition: The table of organization of an effective community school must include (something like) a *fulltime associate principal for community activities who is a fully tenured school district employee*. The position must not be paid for by "soft money" (i.e., experimental grants from government agencies, foundations, private corporations); it must be a routine item in the regular school budget. In short, the position must be firmly institutionalized in the school system. To fill it effectively, however, would require individuals with special personalities, apitudes and training—training which differs significantly from that now normally provided professional educators. For example, such training might take the form of an innovative dual degree program by a university's School of Education and School of Social Work—a possibility we have begun to explore at Penn.

No implication is intended that the specific example just cited

shows that we believe we now know how to overcome the "organizational and governance obstacle" to the development and maintenance of a decentralized system of cosmopolitan community schools. We do not—and we know we do not. What the example is intended to suggest is that our explicit awareness of the need to solve the "perplexity" started us thinking consciously and hard about it. As a result, we not only began to discuss it with Penn colleagues but with colleagues at other universities who specialize in participatory action research designed to help transform conventional, hierarchically organized industrial enterprises into enterprises based on "democratic," "participatory management." Can the "lessons" they have learned in working with various kinds of industrial enterprises be appropriately adapted to community schools? Are there some valid or credible general theoretical propositions applicable to such different types of "enterprises" as for-profit industrial factories and community public schools?

Whether the discussions cited above actually turn out to be fruitful remains to be seen. At the minimum, however, we believe they represent a significant advance in our thinking about community schools. We can characterize that advance by saying that we now have a much clearer understanding of the complex set of difficulties inherent in any "crusade" to bring about a *durable* "community school revolution" in America. The failure of past community school enthusiasts to appreciate those difficulties, we are convinced, is one major reason they failed to revolutionize the American public school system. That system became strongly institutionalized during the early decades of the twentieth century. To overcome its great institutional inertia takes much more than enthusiasm. Enthusiasm functions as a double-edged sword. It provides energy; it also tends, however, to disastrously downplay or ignore difficulties which cannot be willed away but must be confronted and solved. And that brings us to the *resources obstacle* to the transformation of the existing conventional public school system into a decentralized system of cosmopolitan community schools.

As emphasized above, by their very nature, community schools engage in far more activities and serve far wider constituencies than do conventional schools. To do that, a community school serving a specific neighborhood requires far more resources than does a conventional school serving the same neighborhood. Where will those additional resources come from? What strategy is likely to secure them?

More resources does not only mean money. It also means, among many other things, knowledge, skilled personnel, power to fight off attempts to prevent schools carrying out functions other organizations regard as "belonging" to them and not to schools, power to secure cooperation on behalf of school-based or school-initiated community projects from normally competitive leaders of organizations prone to engage in "ego and turf wars." To secure the additional resources conventional public schools need to transform themselves into community schools, requires major assistance from a variety of institutions (e.g. government agencies, corporations, trade unions). Above all, we are convinced, it requires major assistance from universities (broadly conceived to include colleges)—particularly in the early stages of the process when the transformation problems are greatest and the transformation benefits relatively small. More precisely, we mean both assistance from and mutually-beneficial collaboration with, a wide range of a university's schools, departments, and administrative offices. To illustrate the point, we now sketch some aspects of the project we have been engaged in to help the John C. Turner Middle School (grades 6-8) transform itself from a typical, highly bureaucratized, conventional inner-city ghetto school highly unlikely to overcome the increasingly severe personal and educational handicaps its students suffer from into a radically innovative community school more likely to provide "effective education."

As noted above, after 1985, WEPIC achieved increasing success in working with several West Philadelphia schools. (*Success* is a relative term: no implication is intended that drastic improvement occurred in any of those schools.) Moreover, excellent professional and personal relationships existed between Penn faculty members involved in WEPIC and strategic Pennsylvania state government officials. As a result, in 1989, those officials responded favorably to a request from the West Philadelphia Partnership to begin the process of trying to transform conventional public schools into community schools.

Largely because of the interest and leadership of the Turner school principal, it was chosen as the primary center for community school development. Given the limited extent of Penn resources available, Penn's long institutional resistance to serious involvement with West Philadelphia problems, and the intrinsic difficulty of transforming conventional schools into community schools, we decided that the best strategy was to try to achieve a visible, dramatic success in one school rather than marginal, incremental changes in a number of schools. That is, while continuing the WEPIC program at other schools, the community school project would concentrate on Turner.

Once the decision was made to concentrate on Turner, the principal appointed a teacher with long WEPIC experience to the newly created position of *community school coordinator*. Her responsibilities were defined to include working with: a) Penn; b) representatives of the "Turner community" (i.e., the catchment area from which Turner draws its students); c) most critically, with the Turner staff. Her reporting line would be directly to the principal.

Following the general practice of participatory action researchers, no attempt was made to develop a detailed blueprint, or schedule, or "map" at the beginning of the project, which, it was hoped, would eventually lead to conversion of a highly institionalized conventional school into an innovative community school. (Unlike the Turner Middle School, Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem was literally a new school and its charismatic first principal, Leonard Covello, explicitly began it as an experimental community school.) For Penn to help Turner transform itself into a community school, it seemed reasonable to anticipate, would require what William F. Whyte calls a complex evolutionary process of "organizational learning."[2]

To set the evolutionary process in motion and loosely guide it, however, a set of general decisions were made (more-or-less by consensus): the roles for community members would develop and expand in the process of working on school and community issues; Penn faculty and staff, as appropriate to their role, would make suggestions, encourage new directions, try to provide requested resources and help develop ideas with Turner staff and community leaders; the WEPIC staff would administratively coordinate the project; *final* decisionmaking power would be held by those officially

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

responsible for Turner's operation, namely its principal and teachers.

As specific plans were developed to translate the general community school idea into real-life concrete practice at Turner and as organizational structures were created, the community school coordinator requested and received appropriate Penn resources. Seminars, studios, practicums and research projects focused on the Turner School were developed in a number of Penn's schools, specifically, Arts and Sciences, Education, Social Work, Fine Arts, Dentistry, Business, and Medicine. As that occurred, the common goal of helping Turner stimulated some limited degree of academic integration across the university. Moreover, the mutually-beneficial nature of the Turner project for all (or most) participants became increasingly evident. As difficulties emerged and were dealt with, a sense of genuine partnership began to develop; it became clear that the eventual transformation of Turner into a community school could only be achieved by an ever-widening group of specialists consciously engaged in *sustained, long-term, face-to-face, communal participatory action research.* Put another way, it became clear that for the project to succeed eventually, personal relationships and personal trust had to evolve gradually among normally hostile specialists. More precisely, for the project to succeed, a positive dynamic interaction had to develop over time between the evolution of ideas and the evolution of personal relationships and trust. That kind of sustained, continuing interaction helps generate the "creative surprises" which, William Whyte has observed, play highly important roles in the evolutionary process basic to participatory action research.[43] As we now try to suggest, his observation is supported by our experience in the Turner project.

From WEPIC's inception, for both theoretical and practical reasons, major emphasis has been given to developing direct and indirect linkages between schooling and job training. By "theoretical reasons", we essentially mean that we view school-based job-training in Deweyan rather than "vo-tech" terms. That is, we view job-training not primarily as training for a specific job but as a strategic psychological and pedagogical means to help students: a) overcome alienation, learned dependency, learned helplessness, learned hopelessness, self-contempt, self-destructiveness; b) develop self-discipline, self-reliance, self-esteem, orderly work habits, ingenuity, responsibility, cooperative dispositions; c) develop an interest in, and capacity for, learning increasingly higher order intellectual and problem-solving skills (e.g., reading, writing, calculating, systematic and critical thinking, open-ended problem-solving, imaginative expression in various forms). By "practical reasons", we essentially mean that, to-date, funds to pay for WEPIC activities have largely come from job-training programs (city, state, federal).

Given WEPIC's history, it is not surprising that funds for the Turner community school project have largely come from job-training sources. When the project began in 1989, however, for a variety of reasons, we thought of job-training primarily in terms of building construction, landscaping, etc., *not healthcare*. As of the summer of 1991, however, we have come to see that focusing on healthcare job-training may be the best way to develop and sustain the community school project. How that change occurred illustrates and supports Whyte's proposition about the critical role that "creative surprises" play in participatory action research.

Before the project officially began in Spring 1989, a survey of Turner community residents was taken. It found that although effective schooling and jobs were the two most pressing concerns, accessible healthcare and daycare also ranked high. As a result of the community survey and concerns expressed by Turner staff members, the community school coordinator, Mrs. Marie Bogle, asked that Penn undergraduates working in our academically-based public service internship program focus their research on the possibility of developing school-based healthcare and daycare facilities at Turner. In turn, working with our students helped us see that an attempt to develop a *school-based* community health program might be a strategic means to bring together Penn faculty in a variety of schools and departments and effectively involve them in the community school project.

In addition to faculty members in the Schools of Nursing, Medicine, Dentistry, and Social Work, a considerable number of faculty members in Arts and Sciences, Business, Annenberg School of Communications, Law, and Fine Arts have research and/or teaching interests in the field of health. Moreover, the Medical School is *the* high prestige school at Penn, with the largest faculty and a large percentage of the total university budget. It is also part of a much larger Medical Center that includes the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, and is affiliated with Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (and other leading medical facilities). In short, we saw that if health activities could be developed at Turner in ways that fit the interests of Penn (and affiliated) faculty, the potential existed to use Penn's truly great resources in the health field to advance the community school project. How to actually realize that potential, of course, was the Deweyan "perplexity" that had to be solved. After much discussion, wide-ranging explorations, and numerous dead ends, an effective way to begin was found in the summer of 1990.

Dr. Jack Ende, the Director of Ambulatory Care Education in the School of Medicine, agreed to organize a free hypertension screening program for community residents at the Turner School. In turn, his decision led to a series of decisions that significantly moved the community school project forward—but in a direction we did not foresee when we began working on it. That is, to use Dewey's metaphor, the project moved towards its envisioned goal but by means of an unforeseen interlinked series of forked-roads.

Before Dr. Ende decided to organize a hypertension screening program for Turner community residents, the Turner School had received a small grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to begin the process of developing a community-centered curriculum. Supported by that grant, four Turner teachers, headed by Marie Bogle (the community school coordinator), were planning to develop such a curriculum as an experimental means to help teach twenty at-risk students during a six-week summer institute. After learning of Dr. Ende's decision, the teachers revised their original plan. They now concentrated on developing a *community health-centered* curriculum which would use the hypertension screening program as a real-world,community action-oriented, community-serving "project-focused learning vehicle" for the students participating in the summer institute. Similarly, the 1990 summer internship program for Penn undergraduates directed by one of us (Ira Harkavy) was revised so that undergraduate research focused on the problem of how community health and student learning could be interactively improved through development of a community health facility at Turner. In another

related development, the federal Department of Health and Human Services also agreed to provide financial support for three Penn medical students to work under Ende and Bogle during the summer.

At the risk of committing the sin of "instant history," we now see that the 1990 summer institute and community hypertension screening program at Turner marked a "historic" turning point in the community school project. It clearly functioned as the single most effective activity since WEPIC began in 1985 and had substantial, visible, and immediate impact on all participants. Ende's summary enthusiastically suggests the mutual learning and organizational interdependence that it generated:

> The summer institute was a team effort. The Penn medical students supplied the WEPIC teachers with background information and . . . [they also] did a good deal of teaching, including instructing the pupils on how to take blood pressure. The WEPIC teachers, the WEPIC program director, and the curriculum specialists took what the medical students supplied and transformed it into a curriculum appropriate for the seventh grade pupils. (This curriculum will remain at Turner School and be used as part of a general health curriculum to be delivered throughout the regular school year.) The Penn undergraduates worked with the medical students and helped the Middle School pupils carry out a neighborhood health survey and introduced the pupils to some simple concepts of data collection. The Penn medical faculty worked with the medical students and the Penn undergraduates as program supervisors. And the whole effort came together on July 18, when 60 adults from the Turner community turned out to participate in a hypertension screening program that included a health risk survey, a focused medical history, blood pressure determinations by the (supervised) pupils, refreshments, and a round table discussion between Penn medical faculty and community members on the health needs of the community.
>
> The program was received enthusiastically. As a result of this initial success, additional programs are being developed. Plans for the remainder of this academic year [1990-1991] include programs on routine eye problems, which will involve the Ophthalmology faculty and ancillary staff of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, cardiovascular risk factor screening, which will include measurement of cholesterol, blood sugar, smoking habits and family risk factors, and cancer screening. Each program will follow the WEPIC tradition of University-assisted school-based community service, with the dual agenda of addressing important community needs while enriching the school experience of the children.

More ambitious plans developed during the fall of 1990, including a proposal to establish an innovative Neighborhood Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Center at the Turner School to serve as an integrating node for health care referral and health care delivery for community residents. The Center, now in the process of being designed and developed in cooperation with local, state, and federal officials, would function as a pilot demonstration project for improving health promotion and disease prevention, rationalizing health care delivery, and linking the education and health care systems to the benefit of both systems.

In a sense, the most significant development of the 1990 summer institute, however, was its impact on the students and teachers at Turner. The theme of improving the community's health through health improvement *activities* rather than simply through health *information* campaigns has become a growing curricular focus for the Turner School. The twenty students in the summer project, for example, have taught eighty other Turner students in a "school-within-a school" focused on community health about activities students might participate in related to hypertension. Moreover, a graduate student in the School of Education began working with the Turner teachers and is now writing her dissertation on the development of a "holistic curriculum" that will teach all subject areas through action-oriented community-serving, student projects to improve the health both of the Turner community and the students themselves.

Perhaps the best way to indicate how significantly the 1990 summer institute accelerated the community school project, as well as to indicate more specifically how a community school might function to achieve both school and community revitalization, is to quote a successful proposal to the federal Department of Labor for funds to conduct a "Health Careers Work-Based Learning Project" at the Turner School during the summer of 1991. We quote the proposal at length:

> The project builds on the work the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC) has been doing over the past number of years, but involves the development of an innovative school-to- work transition program for school children ages 12-14. The project would involve twenty at-risk students from the Turner Middle School and three teachers in a six-week pilot project linking education, health education, an introduction to health careers, and actual hands-on health career experience. Significant support would be provided by University of Pennsylvania undergraduate students, medical students, and faculty members from across the University (particularly Medical School faculty members). The program will include education and hands-on training at the school site as well as site-visits and educational programs at the University of Pennsylvania Medical Center, Misericordia Hospital, and community health centers.
>
> Some of these ideas have been tried in previous WEPIC efforts. Most relevant, an institute held last summer had significant ongoing educational impact on the students and teachers at Turner. The students learned math, English, science, and social studies through health issues and serving others. (This summer we would add computer-aided instruction, including creating a community health data base that would be based on neighborhood surveys conducted by the students.) During the school year, the summer institute students also taught other students in the school about health care issues. However, a most crucial component was missing last summer—a school-to-work emphasis, involving significant on-site experience at various health facilities. Health institutions are not only the largest employers in West Philadelphia, but these institutions have indicated that a trained, locally-based work

force is among their greatest needs. The school to work focus of the summer institute, therefore, could not be more beneficial to both the students and the employers. As a result of WEPIC's work at the Turner School and the increased involvement of Penn medical students and faculty in that work, excellent relationships now exist between WEPIC and health care providers in West Philadelphia.

The twenty students in the program would attend school every morning from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. Their instruction would be focused on specific health care issues in the community, including nutrition, hypertension, smoking, drug and alcohol abuse, cancer prevention, injuries, and eye problems and eye care. The teachers will be assisted by three Penn medical students and six Penn undergraduates. Neighborhood health surveys will be conducted and actual health services will be provided to community members during at least two evening screenings at the Turner School. Although the screenings will be supervised by medical faculty and medical students, some of the actual services will be delivered by the Turner students themselves. Misericordia Hospital, two community health centers, the City Health Department, as well as the Medical Center of the University of Pennsylvania will provide both instruction at the Turner School and on-site experience at the health facility. The students will become familiar with a range of health careers and learn about the relationship between education and a future in a health profession. The opportunities for a career at a West Philadelphia health care institution will also be emphasized.

The project will have multiple outcomes for both the students and the school and its community.

Student Outcomes:

1. Increased motivation to learn.
2. Increased self-esteem and self-reliance.
3. Higher levels of citizenship.
4. Improved academic performance.
5. Increased acquaintance with the world of work and an appreciation of the relevance of education to the world of work.
6. Introduction to and knowledge of health careers, and an increased interest in pursuing careers in health care.
7. Increased knowledge of health and the development of healthy behaviors.

School and Community Outcomes:

1. The development of a curriculum based on work-based learning and project learning focused on health.
2. The development of a model of learning that combines community serving, problem solving, and work-based experience.
3. The development of a community health data base.
4. The development of a model of school-based health service delivery and health education.
5. Increased cooperation among health care providers in West Philadelphia.
6. Beginning steps toward the development of a trained, locally-based workforce in health care.
7. Deepening engagement of the University of Pennsylvania, particularly the Medical School, in helping to improve West Philadelphia.
8. Further advancing the Turner Middle School as a model of a university-assisted, comprehensive community school with a central focus on community problem solving and service, community health improvement and work-based learning.

The Department of Labor approved the grant request and the 1991 Turner summer institute has recently concluded. Careful evaluation will take some time, of course. But it is already clear that the "school to work emphasis, involving significant on-site experience at various [community] health facilities" represented a qualitative advance over the 1990 experiment. Unlike the first summer institute, in 1991 classroom learning was directly linked to community healthcare facilities and occupations which, on a daily basis, significantly—and visibly—affect the lives of the Turner students, their families, friends and neighbors.

Not by teacher exhortation but through active, "hands on" real-world participation, students saw the relevance of school-learning to life-learning—and to life after school. They could see that because the occupations they learned about and "practiced" (to a very limited extent, of course,) were real rather than simulated occupations, in real institutions, in their own neighbhorhood. As we hope our description makes clear, the 1991 Turner summer institute was guided by, and provided a practical test of John Dewey's theory of *learning by reflective occupational doing* (our term for his theory). The test, of course, was very brief, very limited. But the results were encouraging and support his theory.

To avoid possible misunderstanding, however, we emphasize that though most students who participated in the 1991 summer institute seem to have benefitted significantly, it did not transform them. After six weeks, they remained at-risk students. But the 1991 institute did represent a qualitative advance over its 1990 predecessor and had a variety of positive results. Among other things. 1) it increased our confidence that, appropriately applied, Dewey's general theories of schooling and learning can help radically transform contemporary American public schools for the better; 2) by providing Penn faculty and students from different schools and departments with a common goal encompassing their particular interests and capacities, it significantly strengthened and widened collaboration among them; 3) it advanced the organizational learning of the different institutions participating in the summer institute and effectively began their development of collaborative relationships; 4) it provided a concrete, real community (not "university laboratory") example of how Dewey's general theories might be practically applied.

Given the (relative) success of the 1991 summer institute, it has seemed reasonable to begin planning for an improved model in 1992. Much more significantly, it now seems reasonable to put considerable effort and resources into seriously exploring development of a highly ambitious, genuinely radical project which previously we have only discussed vaguely and speculatively because it so far outran our practical experience and detailed local knowledge. (Unlike "pure" scholastic social researchers who arbitrarily assume away real-world complexity by scholarly fiat, "applied" participatory action researchers subject themselves to reality-testing. They recognize, therefore, that if they hope to do credible good work(s), they must painstakingly acquire both practical experience and detailed local knowledge.)

Oversimply summarized, the project envisions using Penn's great resources in the field of health to accelerate the conversion of Turner into a multifunction community school capable of transforming its catchment area into a genuine community. Derived from Dewey's version of systems theory, the project would directly link the *entire* Turner curriculum to overcoming the problems of its "environment" (i.e., catchment area). If successful, it would integrate three main components and result in: 1) radical transformation of the present, illogically fragmented, Turner "day school" curriculum into an action-oriented, community-serving, holistic "community and student health improvement" curriculum; 2) establishment at Turner of a *limited* community primary health care facility; 3) in collaboration with the institutions participating in the 1991 summer institute, establishment at Turner of a healthcare job training center for its own students, for high school students who live in the Turner catchment area, and for adult residents (e.g., high school dropouts, welfare mothers) who need *relevant* remedial education (and other support) to benefit from job training programs.

Basing three interrelated health components at the same site, we hypothesize, would produce complementary effects and economies of scale. That is, concentration of complementary functions at the same site would increase the likelihood of Turner obtaining the resources (broadly-conceived) it would need to become an effective community center for health-oriented schooling, healthcare delivery, and healthcare job training.

We characterized the project sketched above as "highly ambitious, genuinely radical." Critics, of course, might use other terms—"wildly delusionary," "impossibly complex," "grotesquely grandiose." We are convinced, however, that the long decades of myopic indifference to what James B. Conant warned was "social dynamite" have produced crises afflicting inner-city ghettos such as West Philadelphia which are so deeply-rooted, so interrelated, so overwhelming, so dangerous, that massive *radical* solutions now are the only possible *prudent* solutions. Trying to reform the unreformable is dangerously reckless. That is, incremental, marginal, unintegrated, "reforms" of different subsystems (e.g., schooling, health), we maintain, essentially are public relations gestures and worse than useless. They sustain and strengthen the illusion that "something is being done" to overcome specific problems, distract attention from the need to develop and support strategic, longterm, massive radical solutions, and thereby intensify rather than reduce the crises. Misguided "incremental reformism" is a prescription for disaster.

No implication is intended that at this early exploratory stage we know how the project sketched above would actually work in practice, or even how we can specifically proceed to try to put it into practice to see if it would actually work. We cite it to suggest that, in line with Dewey's proposition about "how we think," our own thinking seems to have advanced qualitatively in the process of engaging in *reflective* realworld action. (*Reflective*, of course, is the key word; thinking by *reflective* doing, not simply by doing.)

We still are a long way from knowing specifically how Penn can help the Turner Middle School become a cosmopolitan community school. In relative terms, however, we have a much clearer idea of how to proceed than when we began the journey several years ago (to use Dewey's forked-road metaphor). More significantly, we now see more clearly that our basic goal should not be to help Turner become a cosmopolitan community school. We now see that development as the strategic *means* to achieve the basic goal of transforming the Turner *catchment area* into a hardworking, cohesive, caring *cosmopolitan community* in a Democratic Welfare Society. In more general terms, as we indicate below, our present Neo-Deweyan strategy envisions using public schools as strategic means to construct the kind of local (i.e., geographic) communities necessary for America to progress beyond the present Welfare State to the Democratic Welfare Society of the 21st century.

6. Universities, Cosmopolitan Local Communities, and A Democratic Welfare Society.

> In its deepest and richest sense a community must always remain a matter of face-to-face intercourse. This is why the family and neighborhood, with all their deficiencies, have always been the chief agencies of nurture, the means by which dispositions are stably formed and ideas acquired which laid hold on the roots of character. . . . The invasion and partial destruction of the life of the . . . [face-to-face local community] by outside uncontrolled agencies is the immediate source of the instability, disintegration and restlessness which characterize the present epoch. Evils which are uncritically and indiscriminately laid at the door of industrialism and democracy might, with greater intelligence, be referred to the *dislocation and unsettlement of local communities*[emphasis added]. Vital and thorough attachments are bred only in the intimacy of an intercourse which is of necessity restricted in range. . . . *There is no substitute for the vitality and depth of close and direct intercourse and attachment* [emphasis added]. . . . Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community.
>
> John Dewey
> *The Public and Its Problems* [1927]

> Education is in crisis in our nation. Our education system has *failed to keep pace with changes in our society and world* [emphasis added]. Unless our nation acts quickly, this failure will fundamentally change the way of life of every American. It will alter our standard of living, our ability to compete, our standing in the world. This is not hyperbole; this is fact. . . . Society will continue to ignore the education crisis at its economic, social, and civic peril. *Education is the single most critical factor in our country's success* [emphasis added]. Without a first rate education system, the United States will fall even further behind its competitors in the world marketplace. Study after study has explored the problems. It is time for action.
>
> John F. Akers
> Chairman of the Business Roundtable
> Education Task Force
> *The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education* (April 1991)

> Across this nation, we must cultivate communities where children can learn. Communities where the school is more than a refuge, more than a solitary island of calm amid chaos. *Where the school is the living center of a community where people care—people care for each other and their futures* [emphasis added]. Not just in the school but in the neighborhood. Not just in the classroom, but in the home.
>
> President George Bush
> *Remarks by the President*
> (April 18, 1991)
> *America 2000: An Education Strategy* (1991)

In 1899, when John Dewey published *The School and Society*, he confidently predicted that the "thorough and radical change" in American society produced by the 19th century economic and communication revolution would inevitably produce "an equally complete transformation" of American public schools. Citing a variety of progressive changes in "our school system," he described them as particular components of the general "New Education" movement well underway in America. Those progressive school changes, he claimed, were "not mere accidents, *they are necessities of the larger social evolution* [emphasis added]."[44]

As Dewey's language indicates, he then believed in a highly deterministic, functional theory of unilinear societal progress. From that general theory, he derived this middle-range proposition: in the age of "economic revolution," societal evolution inevitably produces the appropriate schooling transformation necessary for sustained human progress. However, though inevitable in "its more general features," the process could be significantly influenced by human intelligence and action.

Considered in the context of Dewey's 1899 general theory and middle-range proposition, it seems clear that *The School and Society* was intended, to function in effect, as *The New Education Manifesto* (our title, of course) to speed-up and guide the evolutionary process. It would do that by helping:

> . . . to put the ideas and ideals of the. . . [New Education] into complete, uncompromising possession of our school system. To do this means to make each one of our schools an embryonic community, active with types of occupations that reflect the life of the larger society and permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history and science. When the school introduces and trains each child of society into membership within such a little community, *saturating him with the spirit of service*, [emphasis added], and providing him with the instruments of effective self-direction, we shall have the deepest and best guaranty of a larger society which is worthy, lovely, and harmonious.[45]

A quarter of a century—and a World War—later, Dewey had abandoned the naive optimism of 1899. He no longer believed in a highly deterministic, functional theory of unilinear societal progress resulting from the increasing application of science and the post-1800 economic and communication revolution. As our quotation above from *The Public and Its Problems* (1927) shows, he now emphasized the "instability, disintegration and restlessness which characterizes the present epoch." By 1927, it was clear that the post-1800 "revolution" had not brought about the radical schooling transformation needed to produce a "larger society which is worthy, lovely and harmonious." Contrary to his 1899 analysis, Dewey now recognized that the post-1800 revolution had contradictory effects—great costs as well as great benefits. Its greatest cost, he believed, was "the dislocation and unsettlement of local communities."[46]

In 1899, Dewey had focused attention on the *school* and society; in 1927, he enlarged his theoretical framework and shifted attention to the local *community* and society. Since "outside uncontrolled agencies" had deprived local face-to-face communities of their former vitality, cohesiveness, and power to shape basic social relations (including the family), they could no longer perform their strategic societal roles. The disruption of local communities was primarily responsible for the "instability, disintegration and restlessness which characterizes the present epoch."

Dewey's 1927 lament for the lost local community was, of course, not unique to him. By the late 19th century, it had already become a dominant theme in European and American social thought and given classic theoretical expression by Ferdinand Tonnies in his 1887 book, *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft*.

Translated in English as *Community and Society*,[47] Tonnies' book diametrically contrasted the types of human relationships produced by traditional preindustrial communities and modern industrial societies. Summarized oversimply, Tonnies' theory asserted that by destroying the foundations of local face-to-face communities the forces shaping modern industrial societies had destroyed the bases of social solidarity. Social solidarity was a function of the local community: over time, no local community, no social solidarity.

In direct contrast to the moral, personal, affective quality of social relationships engendered by life in preindustrial communities, modern industrial societies produced amoral, impersonal, contractual, legalistic relationships. Put another way, in modern industrial societies, *social* relationships did not exist. In such societies, human beings regarded all other human beings not as persons to be loved and cherished but essentially as objects to be used for calculated, self-interested, egoistic purposes—as *things* which rational individuals use unemotionally and instrumentally, not as *persons* for whom one cares and cares for.

Whether or not Dewey had been influenced by Tonnies is immaterial here. Our point is that by 1927, in sharp contrast to 1899, he emphasized that scientific, technological, economic, and communication progress had terrible costs as well as great benefits. However, unlike some social theorists who believed that "mass society" was inevitable and that local communities were doomed, Dewey held out the possibility that they would be reconstructed because they were so important for human well-being. Given their intrinsic importance, he argued, they might again become "genuine centers of the attention, interest and devotion for their constituent members." Moreover, since Dewey had not abandoned his basic belief in societal progress, he anticipated that, in major respects, the reconstructed local communities of the future would be superior to their pre-industrial predecessors. We quote him at length:

> Whatever the future may have in store, one thing is certain. Unless communal life can be restored, the public cannot adequately resolve its most urgent problem: to find and identify itself. But if it [i.e., the local community] be restablished, it will manifest a fullness, variety and freedom of possession and enjoyment of meanings and goods unknown in the contigous associations of the past. For it will be alive and flexible as well as stable, reponsive to the complex and world-wide scene in which it is enmeshed. *While local, it will not be isolated* [emphasis added] . . . . Territorial states and political boundaries will persist; but they will not be barriers which impoverish experience by cutting man off from his fellows; they will not be hard and fast divisions whereby external separation is converted into inner jealously, fear, suspicion and hostility. Competition will continue, but it will be less rivalry for acquisition of material goods, and more as emulation of local groups to enrich direct experience with appreciatively enjoyed intellectual and artistic wealth. *If the technological age can provide mankind with a firm and general basis of material security, it will be absorbed in a humane age* [emphasis added]. It will take its place as an instrumentality of shared and communicated experience. But without passage through a machine age, mankind's hold upon what is needful as the precondition of a free, flexible and many-colored life is so precarious and inequitable that competitive scramble for acquisition and frenzied use of the results of acquisition for purposes of excitation and display will be perpetuated.[48]

We quoted Dewey at length for several reasons. One reason is to show that in 1927, as in 1899, he remained an ardent Baconian; he continued to view economic progress resulting from the increasingly powerful application of science and technology as the "precondition" for a "humane age." Another reason is to show that he believed the "new local community" (our term) would transcend the traditional local community. In effect, he predicted that it would represent a highly progressive synthesis of old and new. That is, it would constitute an unprecedented form of social organization—one which retained the desirable qualities of the traditional community but dynamically combined them with the liberating and stimulating qualities made possible by the post-1800 "material" revolution. Put another way, he predicted that the progressive new type of local community would be a *cosmopolitan local community*—as in 1899, he had predicted the cosmopolitan modern school made possible by the post-1800 revolution would transcend the parochial informal learning system of preindustrial society. The main reason we have quoted Dewey at length, however, is to indicate that by 1927 he no longer assigned schools a strategic role in bringing about the progressive changes he envisioned, advocated, and worked for.

As Robert Westbrook has observed, by 1927 Dewey had sharply downgraded schools as agents of progressive change. But he never indicated which other agents or institutions could and would act to reconstruct the local community central to his vision of the "Good Democratic Society" (again our term).[49] By failing to do that, Dewey ignored his own prescription for reflective thought and can reasonably be criticized for engaging in precisely the kind of wishful, wistful "thinking" he deplored. Having asserted that "outside uncontrolled agencies" had invaded and partially destroyed the traditional local community, he was logically obliged to suggest how they were going to be controlled and overcome and cosmopolitan local communities constructed. Who could and would do that? Why? How? Under what conditions?

In a sense, our main purpose in this essay is to focus attention on, and stimulate explicit, serious, sustained, constructive, action-oriented discussion of the critical questions Dewey implicitly raised in 1927 about the functioning of local communities in modern societies. Those questions are now so pressing and so significant, we contend, that they can no longer be evaded. Stated more positively, following Dewey's lead, we contend that any serious proposal to remedy the ills now afflicting American society must now try to solve the "perplexity" of constructing cosmopolitan local communities in the age of the "global village," supranational corporation, and fantastically interactive global economy.

Suppose we grant the validity of Dewey's proposition that the "neighborly community" is indispensable to a well-functioning democratic American society. And suppose we recognize that such communities, with few exceptions, have been severely weakened, if not completely demolished. The question then becomes: Who can and will act effectively to revitalize and reconstruct them? How do we specifically get from here to there? How do we go about constructing the *cosmopolitan local community* in the age of the *global society?*

Rather than simply criticize Dewey for not trying to solve the critical societal "perplexity" implicit in his 1927 analysis, we think it more useful (and Deweyan) to engage in *action-oriented constructive revisionism*. Looking backwards critically to look forward constructively, our argument can be summarily stated:

To help bring about the cosmopolitan local community he envisioned and regarded as indispensable to human well-being and progress, Dewey should have worked hard to develop systematically and rigorously his 1899 middle-range theory about the strategic role public schools *can* play in the progressive evolution of American society. More specifically, we believe he should have explicitly rejected his earlier *idealistic, unrealistic* notion that in 20th century America the school itself could function as "a miniature community," "an embryonic society" (except in the most limited rhetorical sense). Having done that, he then could have used his great prestige and influence to encourage rigorous, genuinely experimental development of the innovative but unsystematic ideas about the *community-centered school* and the *school-centered community* which stimulated widespread enthusiasm and contradictory action in the early decades of the 20th century.

Dewey did not do that. Blessed with 20-20 hindsight and standing on his shoulders (to mix metaphors), living at a time when American society clearly is experiencing multiple crises and when the need for "through and radical change" in the American school system is (almost) universally recognized, we think we pay homage to Dewey by trying to do now what we contend he should have tried to do long ago. More precisely, we believe the "conditions are ripe" to develop and apply a Neo-Deweyan strategy in which universities use their great resources to help transform American public schools into cosmopolitan community schools which function as catalysts and centers for the construction of cosmopolitan local communities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Given the development of such schools and communities, we assume, it becomes possible to progress beyond the Welfare State and construct a Democratic Welfare Society (defined below).

Our strategy emphatically does *not* assume that universities can provide the *financial* resources needed to transform public schools into multipurpose community centers. As the Turner Middle School example in the preceding section was designed to suggest, we assume that universities have a wide variety of resources (broadly conceived) which can be appropriately used to help public schools develop the capacity to function as *government-funded* community centers for the decentralized, systemically-integrated, anti-bureaucratic, *neighborly* delivery of welfare services, e.g., lifelong learning, health care, job training.

Summarily stated, our basic proposition is this: Inspired by Francis Bacon, Benjamin Franklin and John Dewey advocated philosophies of education which can be synthesized as *schooling for service and by service*. *If* university and government resources are effectively combined and, guided by Franklin's philosophy of "doing good to men," public schools become multipurpose centers in which students—and non-student volunteers—are, in Dewey's terms, "saturat[ed] with the spirit of service" and participate appropriately in the planning and delivery of a wide range of welfare services to all residents of their school's catchment area (including themselves), *then* it is likely that: 1) public schools will become effective schools, 2) their catchment areas will be transformed into the type of hardworking, cohesive, caring, cosmopolitan local community Dewey optimistically envisioned in 1927.

Is our proposition reasonable? Can public schools ever possibly do what our Neo-Deweyan strategy proposes that they do? Since public schools now fail to educate even their present students effectively, aren't we proposing to overload them grotesquely? No. Our thesis is that public schools now fail their students because they essentially are *scholastic* institutions which function in pseudo-monastic "medieval" fashion, i.e., isolated from their students' daily lives and the daily life of the areas in which their students live (and die). To overcome that dysfunctional isolation from daily reality, we advocate a highly dynamic interactive strategy in which public schools become community-centered, community-serving, community-creating schools and their catchment areas become school-centered neighborly communities.

In developing our Neo-Deweyan strategy, we have been significantly influenced by a leading American political theorist, Michael Walzer. Responding to criticisms of the Welfare State and the "lessons of history" (our term), Walzer in effect has proposed going beyond both the 19th century Liberal Market Society and the 20th century Welfare State to the 21st century Democratic Welfare Society (our term for his concept).

Summarizing the findings of numerous studies, Walzer observed that the Welfare State institutionalized and expanded "welfare services" (e.g., aid to the sick, disabled, elderly, poor) previously provided in traditional and industrial market societies by families, kin, friends, neighbors, local charitable institutions, and the like. Though the State took over and expanded welfare services beneficially, it not only produced new kinds of dependency but substituted centralized, bureaucratized, legalistic, depersonalized administration for affective, caring help in time of need. As we interpret Walzer, he proposes a new synthesis in which the State guarantees aid and (to a large extent) *finances* the provision of welfare services but delegates their local, personalized, caring delivery to the "Third" (private, non-profit voluntary association) and the "Fourth" (personal, i.e., family, kin, neighbors, friends) Sectors of society.[50] (In the conceptual framework we are using here, the State constitutes the "First Sector" and private, for-profit enterprises the "Second Sector").

To support his proposal to go beyond the Weberian bureaucratic Welfare State, Walzer did not invoke Dewey's general theory of participatory democracy. He might logically have done so, however. From Dewey's general theory, we think it would be reasonable to derive a middle-range theory of the Democratic Welfare Society proposed by Walzer. That derivation seems reasonable because the strategic innovation Walzer proposes calls for "expanded participation in the actual delivery of welfare services" eventually leading to "expanded participation in [welfare] decision-making . . . ." To quote him:

> . . . the first requirement of a [democratic] welfare society is to increase the number of people, recipients and potential recipients, who are also distributors [of welfare services]. Only when that number is increased will it be possible to give recipients and distributors a greater say in welfare management. . . . participation in the delivery of services might constitute a kind of training for participation in the management and direction of service.

Walzer does not propose eliminating the professional "civil servants of the welfare state;" instead, his proposal would create a balance between them and the "extended families, friendly societies, churches and fraternal organizations" which once had "primacy in welfare provision." That is, Walzer proposes to "socialize state action" and "provide new ways" for people "to help themselves and one another" by means of:

> . . . a multitude of networks and institutions for mutual aid. This requires experiments in local democracy; it also requires a state strong enough to superintend and subsidize the work of citizens and volunteers. The greater the number of these citizens and volunteers, the more work they will do as part-time and amateur distributors of goods and services, and the more likely it is that the professional helpers will really be helpful.

Walzer's innovative proposal to decentralize and "socialize welfare services" seems to us to have great possible benefits. But how would it best be implemented concretely? In our judgment, not by creating new experimental agencies. Organizational proliferation would only intensify the fierce rivalry for *welfare clients* that, since the 1920s, has helped produce an increasingly fragmented, increasingly dysfunctional, welfare "system." The best way to realize the benefits inherent in Walzer's proposal, we believe would be to transform and thereby strengthen *existing local societally-necessary, permanent agencies*, public schools.

To a very limited extent, of course, public schools already provide student and family support services. Suppose, however, they were transformed into multipurpose community centers capable of ex-

panding and responsibly supervising the provision of welfare services to *all* residents of their catchment areas. Among many other benefits, public schools then would be better able to help construct the *neighborly communities* necessary for them to function as effective schools. But can that theoretical transformation really be achieved in practice? How do we specifically get there from here?

As we have emphasized repeatedly, we do not now have a detailed road map to get from here to there. Our primary purpose in this essay has been to stimulate sustained, serious discussion of what American universities and other institutions should do to help overcome the radical defects now present in the American public school system and in the American Welfare State—defects which, for a variety of compelling reasons, including institutional self-interest, American universities ought to work hard to overcome. To stimulate discussion of the problem and engender counterposals, we have proposed a Neo-Deweyan strategy that seems theoretically valid and practically doable.

To clarify our strategy, we restate it. We propose that American universities use their great resources to help transform their "local" (however defined) public schools into cosmopolitan community schools which function as multipurpose community-constructing, community centers. Do universities now know how to do that effectively and appropriately? No. To solve that "perplexity", we propose they give it very high priority, follow a Deweyan model of organizational learning by reflective doing, and strongly encourage their faculties and students to engage in communal participatory action research designed to improve human welfare and advance knowledge interactively (e.g., Penn develop a Neo-Baconian, major, permanent, *natural laboratory* focused on West Philadelphia).

In the preceeding issue of *Universities and Community Schools*, we first focused attention on the problem of progressing beyond the Welfare State to the Democratic Welfare Society by presenting the proceedings of an international conference, held at the University of Pennsylvania in March 1990, on *New Modes for Delivery of Voluntary Service: Universities and Other Nongovernmental Organizations*. In this issue, we continue the process by developing our own ideas at length and by publishing a variety of papers presented at another international conference held at Penn in December 1990. That conference focused on *Universities, Community Schools, and School-Based Health Facilities and Job Training*. The four papers printed below reflect different perspectives but have a common theme, namely, that new thinking is mandatory if American schools and universities are to help overcome the serious problems now troubling American society. Stated more positively, they all support the proposition that the complex schooling system of American society, from early childhood centers to major research universities, can be strategically reconceived, reconstructed, and dynamically integrated to help realize the promise of American life in the 21st century.

END NOTES

1. *Universities and Community Schools* is not a scholarly journal. We think it only necessary, therefore, to provide a "barebones" form of documentation; citations are restricted to sources either directly quoted in the text or from which we have directly taken ideas or information. Fuller documentation is provided in two essays from which we have freely drawn: Ira Harkavy and John L. Puckett, "Toward Effective University-Public School Partnerships: An Analysis of a Contemporary Model," *Teachers College Record*, 92: 556-581 (Summer 1991); Ira Harkavy, "The University and Social Sciences in the Social Order: An Historical Overview and 'Where Do We Go From Here?'; *Virginia Social Science Journal*, forthcoming

2. John L. Dewey, *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (Boston, Mass, orig.ed., 1920, enlarged ed., 1948), 28-32.

3. *Ibid.*, 32-34.

4. *Ibid.*, 36-37.

5. *Ibid.*, 37.

6. The edition of Bacon's *New Atlantis* we used was edited by Alfred B. Gough, and published by Oxford University Press in 1915. Our understanding of Bacon's ideas has been heavily influenced by the pathbreaking interpretation presented in Benjamin Farrington, *Francis Bacon: Philosopher of Industrial Science* (New York, 1949).

7. *Ibid.*, 88. The quotation below from Bacon's *Preface* is taken from *ibid.*, 88-89.

8. *Ibid.*, 98.

9. For a narrative, journalistic account of the mechanization of Southern cotton production, see Nicholas Lemann, *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America* (New York, 1991), 3-58; for a scholarly analysis by an economic historian, see Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War* (New York, 1986), 226-249.

10. As quoted in Lemann, *Promised Land*, 51.

11. James Bryant Conant, *Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas* (New York, 1961). The characterization of Conant is from a note "About the Author," *ibid.*, 149. The quotations in the text below are from *ibid.*, 2-18, 146.

12. Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform; 1620-1660* (New York, 1975), 514-520.

13. J.A. Leo Lemay, compiler, *Benjamin Franklin: Writings* (Library of America: New York, 1987), 1252.

14. Webster, *Great Instauration*, 99.

15. Lemay, comp., *Franklin Writings*, 295-297.

16. Edward P. Cheyney, *History of the University of Pennsylvania: 1740-1940* (Philadelphia, 1940), 29. For the complete 1749 text, see Lemay, comp., *Franklin Writings*, 323-344.

17. *Ibid.*, 341-342.

18. Robert B. Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991), 382.

19. *Ibid.*, XIV-XV, and 380-387. For Westbrook's analysis of Dewey's educational theory, see *ibid.*, 93-113, 150-194, and *passim*.

20. John Dewey, *The School and Society* (Chicago, orig. ed., 1899, rev.ed., 1915), 24-26.

21. *Ibid.*, 8-9.

22. *Ibid.*, 9-11.

23. *Ibid.*, 12.

24. Our statement of Dewey's theory of human nature has been strongly influenced by Westbrook, *Dewey, XIV-XV*, 286-293, 319-372, and *passim*.

25. Dewey, *School and Society*, 36.

26. *Ibid.*, 13 and 6-29.
27. *Ibid.*, 37,26.
28. *Ibid.*, 31-34.
29. George Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey* (Carbondale, Ill., 1973), 86-115; Westbrook, *Dewey*, 93-113.
30. Herbert Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum; 1893-1958* (Boston, Mass., 1986), 79.
31. Dewey, *School and Society*, 17-18, and 12-24.
32. Westbrook, *Dewey*, 99-104.
33. For the division of community "influentials" into *cosmopolitans* and *locals*, see the influential essay by Robert Merton in his *Social Theory and Social Structure* (New York, Free Press, 1968), 441-474.
34. University of Pennsylvania, *Annual Report* 1987-1988 (President's Report), 3.
35. William F. Whyte, ed. *Participatory Action Research* (Newbury Park, CA., 1991), 20-21.
36. See the discussion in Harkavy and Puckett, "University-Public School Partnerships," *Teachers College Record*, 92: 561-564.
37. *Ibid*, 92: 564-576.
38. *Ibid.*, 92: 565.
39. From the early 20th century on, a number of *Yearbooks* published by the National Society for the Study of Education focused on the idea and development of community schools. See in particular its *Forty-Fourth Yearbook* (Chicago, 1945), part I, 209-227, and *Fifty-Second Yearbook, (Chicago, 1953), part II*, entire. The historical sketch of community schools is from ibid., 251-264.
40. *Ibid.*, 49-63.
41. *Ibid.*, 270-272.
42. Whyte, ed., *Participatory Action Research*, 237-241.
43. *Ibid.*, 97-98.
44. Dewey, *School and Society*, 28-29.
45.*Ibid.*, 29.
46. For Dewey's discussion of the significance of local communities, see the chapter, "The Problem of Method," in his *The Public and Its Problems* (Denver, Colo., 1954 printing, originally published in 1927), 185-219. Our attention was drawn to Dewey's emphasis on the local community by the brief but penetrating analysis in Westbrook, *Dewey*, 313-318.
47. See the translation by Charles P. Loomis, published as Ferdinand Tonnies, *Fundamental Concepts of Society (Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft)* (New York, 1940. For a concise summary of Tonnies' ideas, see the "Translator's Introduction," *ibid.*, IX-XXVII.
48. Dewey, *Public and Its Problems*, 216-217.
49. Westbrook, *Dewey*, 315-318.
50. See Walzer's essay, "Socializing the Welfare State," in Amy Gutmann, ed., *Democracy and the Welfare State* (Princeton, N.J., 1988), 13-26. The quotations in the text below are from *ibid*, 21-24 and 26.